



National Foundation for Educational Research

The support staff study: exploring experiences of training and development

NFER:

David Teeman
Ellie Mundy
Matt Walker
Emma Scott
Yin Lin
Simon Gallacher

Ipsos MORI:

Matt Barnes
Chris Phillips
Fiona Johnson

August 2009

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
1. INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 An introduction to the support staff study	2
1.2 The context for the support staff study	2
1.3 The role of this support staff study	8
2. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE SUPPORT STAFF TELEPHONE SURVEY	10
2.1 Aims and methodology	10
2.2. Sample profile and employment status	11
Key findings about sample profile and employment status	11
2.3 The overall profile of staff	12
2.4 Previous employment	15
2.5 Conditions of current employment	16
2.6 Length of time at current school	20
2.7 Length of time in current role at any school	21
3. QUALIFICATIONS AND ICT SKILLS	23
Key findings about qualifications and ICT	23
3.1 Mathematics qualifications	25
3.2 English qualifications	27
3.3 Highest academic qualification	28
3.4 Vocational and professional qualifications	29
3.5 ICT skills	32
3.6 Qualifications and ICT skills: Wave 2 regression analysis	33
3.7 Qualifications and ICT skills: change over time analysis	38
4. EXPERIENCES OF MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW PROCESSES	40
Key findings about experiences of management and performance review processes	40
4.1 Training and development needs	42
4.2 Line management	44
4.3 Performance review processes	46
4.4 Experiences of management: Wave 2 regression analysis	47
4.5 Experiences of management: change over time analysis	50
5. MOTIVATION, BARRIERS AND INFORMATION NEEDS	53
Key findings about motivation, barriers and information needs	53
5.1 Reasons for selecting training and development	55
5.2 Barriers to training and development	56
5.3 Information about training and development	57
5.4 Motivation, barriers and information needs: Wave 2 regression analysis	59
5.5 Motivation, barriers and information needs: change over time analysis	64
6. EXPERIENCES OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT	66
Key findings about training and development	66
6.1 Induction for current role	68

6.2	Training and development in the past 12 months	69
6.3	Focus, location and provider of most recent training	70
6.4	Training for qualification or status	74
6.5	Experiences of training and development: Wave 2 regression analysis	76
6.6	Experiences of training and development: change over time analysis	78
7.	SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT	81
	Key findings about satisfaction with training and development	81
7.1	Quality and relevance of training and development	82
7.2	Benefits of training and development	83
7.3	Satisfaction with training and development: Wave 2 regression analysis	85
7.4	Satisfaction with training and development: change over time analysis	87
8.	SUPPORT STAFF WITH MORE THAN ONE ROLE	89
	Key findings about staff with more than one role	89
8.1	Differences in training and development between roles for support staff with more than one role	90
8.2	Support staff with more than one role: Wave 2 regression analysis	92
9.	THE LEADERS SURVEY: INTRODUCTION AND SAMPLE PROFILE	94
9.1	Introduction	94
9.2	Key findings	96
9.3	The overall profile of leaders	97
10.	DEPLOYMENT OF SUPPORT STAFF AND FUTURE PLANNING	101
	Key findings about the deployment of support staff and future planning	101
10.1	Factors determining roles and responsibilities of support staff	103
10.2	Confidence in school leadership	104
10.3	The importance of support staff roles in meeting policy needs	105
10.4	The hours worked by support staff	106
10.5	Deployment of support staff and future planning: regression analysis	108
11.	THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF SUPPORT STAFF	111
	Key findings about the professional development of support staff	111
11.1	Identifying the needs of support staff	113
11.2	Access to training and development provision	114
11.3	Areas for professional development	116
11.4	Effective professional development activities	117
11.5	Professional development of support staff: regression analysis	120
12.	TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR SUPPORT STAFF	123
	Key findings about training opportunities for support staff	123
12.1	The selection of external training providers	124
12.2	The most important considerations when selecting an external training provider	125
12.3	The importance of factors informing the selection of external training providers: regression analysis	127

13. BARRIERS TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	129
Key findings and barriers to professional development	129
13.1 Funding support staff training and development	130
13.2 Releasing staff for training and development	131
13.3 The timing of support staff training and development	133
13.4 Barriers to professional development: regression analysis	134
14. VIEWING THE STAFF AND LEADERS SURVEYS TOGETHER	137
14.1 Line management	137
14.2 Identifying and meeting needs	137
14.3 The reasons for selecting training	137
14.4 Accessing training	138
14.5 The type of training	138
14.6 Barriers	138
14.7 Considering both surveys together	138
15. REFERENCES	139
APPENDIX A. SAMPLE REPRESENTATIVENESS AND ETHNICITY	142
APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRES	150
B1 Support staff telephone questionnaire, Wave 2	150
B2 Leaders survey questionnaire	170
APPENDIX C. REGRESSION ANALYSIS	180
C1.1 Explanation of regression analysis for Wave 2 of the telephone survey	180
C1.2 Explanation of regression analysis for change over time	182
C1.3 Explanation of regression analysis for the leaders survey	183
C2 Regression variables	186
C3 Support staff telephone survey: Wave 2 regression tables	189
C4 Support staff telephone survey: change over time regression tables	205
C5 Leaders survey: regression tables	208
APPENDIX D. SUPPORT STAFF CATEGORIES AND ROLES	214
APPENDIX E. FURTHER METHODOLOGICAL EXPLANATION	215
E1 Support staff telephone survey, methodology, response details and analysis and reporting	215
E2 The leaders survey, analysis and reporting	226

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Training and Development Agency for Schools.

Acknowledgements

The research team would like to thank the schools who agreed to participate in the study, many for a second time, and their staff who took the time to provide information. We would particularly like to thank the support staff who agreed to be surveyed, the staff in schools who fielded the calls from interviewers and those that participated in the leaders survey. We would also like to thank the call staff at Ipsos MORI who conducted the Wave 2 of the support staff telephone survey.

We would also like to thank colleagues from NFER who provided invaluable research input and support, namely:

- Caroline Sharp, Principal Research Officer, who directed the support staff study from May 2006 to December 2008.
- Adél Várnai, Senior Research Officer, Ipsos MORI, who was project leader from 2006 to July 2008.
- Rebekah Wilson, Senior Research Officer, who contributed to the development of the Wave 2 telephone survey.
- Vani Cardozo, Project Administrator, who has provided outstanding administrative support to the research team, and to her colleagues Vanessa Burns, Sue Stoddart and Jill Ware who at various times assisted with project administration.
- Sarah Walkey, Mark Bailey, Kerstin Modrow and Nigel Kentleton who drew the schools sample, requested schools to provide information, designed the online proforma for collecting support staff information and administered the leaders survey.
- Louise Maycock and Marco Pomati, statisticians, who checked and contributed to amending reports and technical appendices.
- Fiona Walker, Principal Research Officer (Children's Services), who read and reviewed reports.

Finally, the research team would like to thank the Training and Development Agency for Schools for commissioning and managing this research, and in particular Marianne Abery, Tom Riley, Trinley Walker, Annabelle Doherty and Helen Russell for their consistently cooperative, responsive and facilitative support and research management.

1. Introduction

1.1 An introduction to the support staff study

This report sets out the summative findings from a three-year study commissioned by the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA), which explored the training and development of school support staff in England¹. It was led by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) in partnership with researchers from Ipsos MORI. The study comprised two main strands: large-scale telephone surveys of support staff (in November 2006 and 2008) and a survey of senior school leaders conducted in November 2008. Taken together, the findings from these strands provide valuable insights into both support staff experiences of training and development and the key issues relating to the training, development and deployment of support staff from the perspective of senior school leaders.

1.2 The context for the support staff study

1.2.1 Policy drivers

It is important to set the work of the TDA and this study in the wider context of education policy and practice, and more broadly other economic and social factors. It is also important to consider the policy and practice context that inevitably influences efforts to develop a professional schools work force. Therefore a desk study was conducted and used to inform the content of this report. The key findings are set out below.

The policy agenda within education has consistently focused on school improvement and pupil achievement. However, more recently the developing policy agenda has resulted in significant change; transferring choice and responsibility to individual schools within a broad needs-based framework of coordinated provision for the child, witnessed by the Children Act (England and Wales, Statutes, 2004) and ‘Every Child Matters: Change for Children’ (HM Government, 2004). Individual governmental policy initiatives and strategic foci are consistent with these developments, and include:

¹ The TDA has an England-only remit (TDA, 2009a).

- delivering on the Every Child Matters (ECM) agenda
- the development of an integrated children's service, each local authority having a Director of Children's Services
- the drive for school improvement, underpinned by self evaluation in schools, new teacher professionalism and revised performance management, and performance review arrangements
- the development of a children's workforce (and within this a schools' workforce)
- school workforce remodelling and professional development, underpinned by the introduction of new professional standards for teachers, national occupational standards for staff supporting teaching and learning, and higher level teaching assistant (HLTA) standards
- attuning learning better to the needs of pupils, underpinned by the personalisation of learning (which itself includes learning to learn, school improvement, collaboration, information and communications technology (ICT) and broadband, Assessment for Learning, pupil and parental voice and choice)
- developing and fully rolling out the Extended Schools programme.

The current and future economic situation will have implications for schools and for their workforce, for instance:

- At times of high unemployment, the recruitment to all categories of school staff is likely to become easier for those recruiting, but much more competitive for those applying; hence the levels of skills and expertise required by employers rise, and the acquisition of such skills and experience are likely to be more prized by staff who need to make successful applications/career changes.
- A key overall aim of the children's workforce, and hence the school workforce is to help drive and deliver ECM, including elements such as narrowing gap(s) in relation to issues such as educational achievement and health², reducing child poverty, keeping healthy and safeguarding children; difficulties in the economy (and localised pockets of severe economic disadvantage) are likely to mean all schools and some in particular will face increasing challenges in regards to these key ECM outcomes.
- The finance available to and within schools could, for many reasons, be negatively affected by the economic climate, namely less finance being available at the same time as demand relating to ECM outcomes potentially increases, putting greater strain on those working in schools.

² Gaps which exist for some groups of children, such as those living in areas marked by high measures of deprivation.

The economic context will need consideration when planning for school workforce remodelling and development. In any event, these contextual factors and drivers of change will have an impact on and have implications for all those who work in and with the school elements of the children's workforce.

1.2.2 The TDA and school support staff development

The TDA is the national agency and recognised sector body responsible for the training and development of the school workforce in England. In 2004, the remit of the TDA was enhanced to include the training and development of the wider school workforce. This was further extended the following year when the Agency was asked by Her Majesty's Government to take forward work focusing on Continuing Professional Development (CPD) for teachers.

Consequently, the key purpose of the TDA became "To raise children's standards of achievement and promote their well-being by improving the training and development of the whole school workforce." (TDA, 2009). Following the extension of the TDA's role, the School Workforce Development Board (SWDB) was established in 2004. It took the form of a sector-wide body chaired by the TDA, to guide the Agency's work on the training and development of support staff.

The SWDB published an interim plan, 'Building the School Team' (TDA, 2005). This identified the Board's three priorities for action: removing barriers that prevent the take up of training and development; improving the supply of training and development; and strengthening the quality of training and development. Building on the interim plan, the SWDB published a three-year strategy, 'Developing People to Support Learning' (TDA, 2006), which set out the commitments of the SWDB member organisations to develop the wider school workforce. Through this strategy the SWDB expressed its three objectives:

- supporting schools to develop new ways of training and deploying their staff
- creating a framework of standards and qualifications to enable schools to develop the potential of all support staff
- extending training opportunities to meet the development needs of all support staff.

In 2008, the TDA published a five year strategic plan, covering a period up to 2013, with the priorities of addressing workforce supply, workforce development and workforce reform. These priorities are underpinned by, reflect, and driven by the range of policy developments previously discussed.

The TDA's CPD strategy for teachers (2007-10) outlines how the agency intends to stimulate informed demand for professional development and ensure high quality supply to meet that demand (TDA, 2009b).

For support staff, the TDA's skills strategy for the wider school workforce 2006-09 presents a vision for achieving a sustainable increase in workforce skills over the 3-year period (TDA, 2006).

The TDA is now bringing together these separate arrangements into a single strategy for the professional development of the children's workforce that fall within the TDA's remit in schools, namely teachers and support staff. The new strategy will be aligned with and set in the context of the DCSF White Paper on 21st Century Schools, will cover the period 2009-12 and will guide the TDA's professional development programmes and activities. This is being supported by a National Advisory Group (NAG) that provides support and challenge to the TDA on all aspects of professional development for the school workforce.

The rolling out of the extended schools programme and the continued development of the Children's Services framework within which school provision sits continues to drive and in many ways determine demands placed on support staff and their deployment within schools. As part of addressing the five ECM outcomes and Children's Services Framework, the intention of the NAG is to draw together relevant agencies to form a new children's workforce to work to meet objectives in relation to safeguarding children, narrowing gaps, improving attainment, providing a voice to pupils and parents and providing a more personalised experience to learning. Furthermore, the Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC) provides a range of support for the training and development of staff from relevant sectors, including early years and childcare, education welfare and social care for children and young people.

The range of support staff roles in schools has diversified considerably in recent years. School Business Managers (SBMs) and Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTAs) are just two of the roles which have particularly developed during this time. Both roles appear to be increasingly helping schools to deliver effective whole school CPD. We know, for example, that many HLTAs share some responsibility for the training and development of other support staff, particularly teaching assistants (TAs) (Robinson et al., 2008). In addition, as illustrated by recent evaluations, a growing number of SBMs are establishing themselves as members of school leadership teams, and are using their expertise in resource management and the identification of training and development needs for the benefit of the whole school, and support staff in particular (Wright et al, 2007).

However, findings from the Deployment and Impact of Support Staff (DISS) project, the largest study of support staff yet undertaken, suggest that teachers are becoming increasingly involved in taking charge of the day-to-day deployment of support staff who work with them, and are increasingly responsible for the formal aspects of their line management or their performance reviews or appraisals (Blatchford et al., 2008). This has to a degree changed the type of work undertaken by teachers, which the findings from an earlier report suggest could be problematic, as many have not had any training to help them work with support staff in the classroom (Blatchford et al., 2007).

To support a whole school approach to CPD, the TDA has brought together a range of resources and programmes to make it easier for SBMs and other staff to train and develop support staff, and identify ways of deploying them to achieve better outcomes³. For example, research (Wilson et al., 2007) commissioned by the TDA resulted in the ‘Good Practice Model for HLTA Deployment’. The model is designed to help school CPD leaders make strategic deployment decisions about the appropriate deployment of support staff, and consists of clear cut steps that are based on in-depth interviews with

³ The booklet ‘Unlock the potential of your support staff: develop the bigger picture’ summarises these resources and identifies a five stage process to maximize the development and contribution of support staff in schools: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/l/leaflet_ss_development.pdf (19/03/09). See www.tda.gov.uk/cpd for resources including ‘Support staff CPD: A guide for school leaders’ which provides guidance on qualification routes for support staff, helps school leaders identify and assess suitable qualification options for support staff development and find sources of further information and guidance. General information can be found at: <http://www.tda.gov.uk/leaders/supportstaff> and www.tda.gov.uk/support. Further, ‘A career guide for support staff, Realise your potential’ is a guide for support staff on their career development options.

HLTAs, senior leaders and teachers in nine case study schools. This practitioner-led approach was purposefully adopted in order to make the model a useful tool for schools⁴.

The TDA (with partners in the other three UK countries) has also developed the National Occupational Standards (NOS) for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools to encompass the much broader range of roles that support pupils' learning in schools; including cover supervision, pastoral and welfare roles, supporting pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL), and those offering specialist support to children with special educational needs (SEN), stemming from remodelling and other policy initiatives. Developed with reference to the new and revised standards for teachers and HLTAs, this new framework of professional and occupational standards collectively describes the role of all classroom practitioners. NVQs based on the revised NOS have been offered by four QCA-accredited awarding bodies since March 1st 2008⁵.

The TDA CPD Leadership project was established in 2006 to build an evidence base of the ways local authorities, the TDA and others currently support CPD leadership in schools, in order to develop effective support in the future. Findings from the project show that the majority of CPD leaders are part of the school leadership team⁶ and lead CPD as part of a wider role. An increasing number have extended CPD to the whole school workforce, and are looking to exploit its potential within the school. CPD leaders currently face a number of challenges, which can be categorised as: cultural - changing staff perceptions of the value and nature of CPD; capacity - finding the time and money and securing the authority to carry out the role effectively; operational - identifying needs, developing CPD opportunities, and evaluating impact; and specific - addressing current initiatives such as performance management and review, professional and occupational standards, and extending CPD to the wider workforce. These findings were confirmed by a national survey of CPD leaders undertaken in 2008 (see Robinson et al., 2008). To help share the key

⁴ The Model of Good Practice is available online: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/nfer_hlta_deployment_model.pdf (19/03/09).

⁵ More information on the Standards, and comprehensive guidance to support school leaders to use the standards for a range of staff development activities, can be found on http://www.tda.gov.uk/leaders/supportstaff/NOS/Supporting_teaching_learning.aspx.

⁶ For further information please see 'Making a difference: promoting and supporting the leadership of continuing professional development', available at: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/cpd/cpd_leadership_phase_%202.pdf

findings from this and other studies, the TDA has brought together guidance and resources on their website to ensure CPD is valued and effective in schools⁷ (also, TDA, 2007; 2009b; TDA, 2009c).

An Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) report described the most effective practice for CPD in schools as being a 'logical chain' of procedures which places CPD at the heart of schools' planning for improvement and School Improvement Plans (SIPs). Schools that integrated performance management, self-review and CPD into a coherent cycle improved teaching and learning, and standards rose (Ofsted, 2006). However, developing effective links between CPD leaders' work and school improvement takes time (DfES, 2005). Evidence of effective practice suggests it is crucial that CPD is effectively led and managed in schools (TDA, 2007).

These developments have highlighted the growing consensus that CPD has a key role to play in setting the foundations for and helping to develop the schools part of the children's workforce. Therefore, continuing school improvement and effective CPD leadership in schools are seen as crucial.

It is also clear that the introduction of the revised performance management and review arrangements and new professional and occupational standards for teachers and support staff make support for CPD leadership timely and appropriate. The publication of the DCSF 'Children's Plan' (DCSF, 2008a) and 'Being the best for our children' (DCSF, 2008b) with proposals for an M-level teaching profession have further served to reinforce the significance of CPD and its leadership.

1.3 The role of this support staff study

The context presented above shows there was a need for more information about support staff experiences of training and development and the key issues relating to the training, development and deployment of support staff from the perspective of senior school leaders.

For instance, prior to this research, evidence was limited on: the qualifications held by support staff; the training and development activities undertaken by

⁷ See <http://www.tda.gov.uk/teachers/continuingprofessionaldevelopment/cpdleadership.aspx>.

support staff; the perceptions of support staff towards training; senior leaders' views on the future roles to be played by support staff in schools; and the employment and deployment profiles of support staff and the key factors that contribute to this. The TDA, therefore, commissioned NFER in partnership with Ipsos MORI to conduct research to support and inform its work.

The findings from the research reported here will inform the TDA's planning, communications and training provision, and the work of the new National Advisory Group and member organisations.

To retain clarity and accessibility, the findings from the two strands of the research have been separated. The report is split into three parts: the first presents the telephone survey of support staff (Sections 2 to 8), the second presents the leaders survey (Sections 9 to 13), and the final part (Section 14) presents key comparisons and contrasts between the staff and leaders surveys. A bibliography is included at Section 15 and all sections contain references to five appendices, A - E.

2. An introduction to the support staff telephone survey

2.1 Aims and methodology

The staff survey had three overarching research aims:

- to explore support staff experiences and perceptions of their training and development
- to provide findings which specifically fill gaps in current knowledge about the training and development of support staff and their related needs
- to measure change over time.

The research was conducted over a three-year period (June 2006 to May 2009), and employed three research methods:

- two telephone surveys of support staff (Wave 1 in November 2006 and Wave 2 in November 2008)
- a survey of senior school leaders in November 2008
- a desk study.

For the second of this study's two telephone surveys (Wave 2), and following a comprehensive information-gathering exercise involving Wave 1 schools (and a top-up sample of 'new' schools), 809 schools provided details of their support staff and 3,261 support staff were surveyed from across the primary, secondary and special school sectors. The sample of schools was selected and maintained to reflect the national picture and provide findings which are generalisable at this level. Therefore, this study was able to provide evidence about the training and development of all support staff, relating findings to different types of schools and to different support staff roles.

Following piloting, the second of the two surveys was conducted in the autumn term of 2008. These data have also been compared to findings from Wave 1, thereby enabling analysis of changes over time. The resulting data

was interrogated using descriptive, factor and regression analysis. Relevant wave one findings are included throughout the following sections.⁸

As in Wave 1, the Wave 2 survey collected information from support staff about their background, qualifications, information and communications technology (ICT) skills, their experiences of management and performance review processes, experiences and perceptions of any training they had received and about how they had accessed (and would like to access) information about training and development.

To help differentiate telephone survey findings, respondents are referred to as staff.

2.2. Sample profile and employment status

The remainder of this section presents key findings and then explores information, derived from Sections A and F of the telephone survey (see Appendix B1), about the overall staff sample in terms of: gender; age; ethnicity; languages spoken and proportions of support staff in these groups in relation to their staff category. The questions in Section A also explored a range of background factors in relation to the employment status of support staff in schools. These were:

- previous role
- current employer
- the nature of their employment contract (i.e. permanent/fixed-term, full-time/part-time, how staff are paid)
- length of time employed in their current school
- length of time in their current role.

Key findings about sample profile and employment status

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- The majority of staff were female (87 per cent) and nearly all were white (96 per cent). They were distributed across the age range 18 to 55 and

⁸ For wave one findings see www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/sss_gf.pdf.

over, and nearly all (98 per cent) most often spoke English at home compared to another language.

- About two thirds of staff (65 per cent) had not been working in education prior to their current position, about a fifth (21 per cent) said they had been working at a different school and about half of these reported having worked in a different role, while about a tenth (11 per cent) said that they had been at the same school in a different role before taking up their current role.
- Support staff were mostly employed on permanent contracts (88 per cent) with a broadly equal distribution of support staff employed on part-time⁹ (52 per cent) and full-time contracts (48 per cent). Most staff worked for their local authority (84 per cent) and had their wages paid throughout the year (94 per cent) whether they were contracted for hours in term-time only or for all 52 weeks.
- About three quarters of staff (73 per cent) had been employed at their current school for three years or more and the same proportion said that they had been in their current role (at any school) for three years or more.

2.3 The overall profile of staff

2.3.1 Staff' gender, age and ethnicity

Based on a total response of 3,261, Table 2.1 below shows the achieved sample profile by gender, age and ethnic background.

Table 2.1 Achieved sample by gender, age and ethnicity

	Gender:		Age:				Ethnicity:	
	male	female	18-34	35-44	45-54	55 +	white	minority ethnic staff
N=	438	2823	503	1050	1106	590	3117	131
%	13	87	15	32	34	18	96	4
N=missing	-		12				13	

N=3261

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100¹⁰

The high proportion of female staff compared to male staff is immediately noticeable, and is the same as found at Wave 1 and in line with other similar studies. The sample included staff from across a wide age range, two thirds of

⁹ Staff working up to 30 hours per week.

¹⁰ Full ethnicity information was collected (see Technical Appendix A, Table A4). However, for the purpose of analysis, due to the small numbers of staff from minority ethnic groups, these groups had to be collapsed into 'minority ethnic staff'. This group does not include anyone identifying themselves as white.

support staff (66 per cent) were distributed across the mid age range bands, leaving the remaining third distributed almost equally between the lower and upper age bands (15 and 18 per cent).

As was the case at the time of Wave 1, there is not (as far as we are able to ascertain) a reliable and comprehensive source of information for the proportion of support staff from minority ethnic groups. Therefore, no target was (or could have been accurately) set regarding the number of support staff from minority ethnic groups to be included in the study. However, as in Wave 1, to help inform our approach to categorising ethnicity, confirmatory statistical analysis was conducted and this revealed that responses from those staff self-identified as 'white' are broadly similar and homogenous in character. Therefore, the approach taken in Wave 1 was also applied to the analysis of Wave 2 data; this involved collapsing the ethnic groups into two categories: 'white' and staff from minority ethnic groups. The 'white' category includes all staff who identified themselves as of white ethnic background, including White European and White South African. Those categorised as belonging to a minority ethnic group were staff who identified themselves as being from any ethnic group other than that classified as white (see Appendix A, Table A4 for full breakdown of ethnicity categorisation). In all cases, staff identified their own ethnicity.

On the basis of the above categorisation, analysis revealed that the proportion of support staff from minority ethnic groups responding to this telephone survey is below that of national census data for the English population. According to national census data, 7.9 per cent of the population in England belong to minority ethnic groups, compared with four per cent of support staff in the achieved sample. Further, data from the Office of National Statistics suggest that ten per cent of the working age population belong to minority ethnic groups¹¹. This might suggest that staff from minority ethnic groups answering the survey are slightly under-represented, when compared to national data¹², and/or slightly under-represented amongst school support staff. These findings are in line with those reported in other recent studies¹³ and the forthcoming 2010 School Workforce Census will provide further clarity on this matter.

¹¹ See <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/Product.asp?vlnk=14238>

¹² It should be noted that sampling at the staff level did not attempt to 'target' a fixed proportion of staff from minority ethnic groups or by gender or age.

¹³ See Blatchford et al, 2007.

2.3.2 Support staff categories by gender, age and ethnicity and language

Table 2.2 shows the sample profile by gender, age and ethnicity by support staff category.

Table 2.2 Support staff category by gender, age and ethnicity

Support staff category	Gender %:		Age %:				Ethnicity %:	
	male	female	18-34	35-44	45-54	55 +	white	minority ethnic staff
Site staff	34	66	8	27	31	34	98	2
Admin staff	5	95	10	31	40	18	97	3
Specialist and technical	43	57	22	25	28	24	96	3
Pupil support	8	92	16	33	33	18	95	4
Learning support	5	95	20	36	32	12	94	6
Teaching assistants	6	94	18	36	35	11	95	5

N=3261

Percentages are based on those providing information about their gender age and ethnicity respectively

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Care should be taken in interpreting this data due to varying and sometimes low numbers of responses

Table 2.2 shows that, as in Wave 1:

- there were larger proportions of males in site and technical roles (34 and 43 per cent) compared with the proportion of males in all other categories (from five to eight per cent)
- generally, across the support staff categories, the smallest proportions of staff were in the lowest age band, with the exception of specialist and technical (22 per cent) and learning support staff (20 per cent). The smallest proportions of staff from the aged 55 and over age band were learning support staff and teaching assistants (12 and 11 per cent respectively)

- in relation to age of staff in the specialist and technical category, there was a broadly equal distribution of staff across all of the age bands (in the range of 22 to 28 per cent)
- those in the 35-44 age band made up of around a third of each of the staff categories (in the range of 31 to 36 per cent), with the exception of specialist and technical staff and site staff (25 and 27 per cent), where there were fewer proportions in this age range
- those in the 45-54 age band made up around a third of each of the staff categories (in the range of 31 to 35 per cent), with the exception of specialist and technical staff where there were fewer (28 per cent) and admin staff where there were more (40 per cent)
- there was a higher proportion of staff in the oldest age band (aged 55 and over) in site staff roles than in other categories (34 per cent).

In Wave 2, to further explore the profile of staff, they were asked about which language they spoke most often at home. Almost all staff (98 per cent) reported that they spoke English most often at home, compared to the remainder (two per cent) who reported that they most often spoke a language other than English at home.

2.4 Previous employment

Support staff were asked to provide details about what they were doing prior to their current role. Staff were provided with a list of response options. Table 2.3 presents the findings.

Of those responding, about:

- two thirds of staff (65 per cent) had not been working in education prior to coming to their current role; overall, two fifths (39 per cent) of support staff said they had been working outside of education and about a fifth (21 per cent) said they had not been working at all
- a third (32 per cent) had been working in education before taking up their current role; a fifth (21 per cent) said they had been working at a different school; about half of these reported having worked in the same role and about half in a different role before starting at their current one
- a tenth (11 per cent) said that they had been at the same school in a different role before taking up their current one.

Table 2.3 Previous employment

Response:		%
Working in current school:	- in this role but on a voluntary basis*	<1
	- in a different role on a paid basis**	11
	- in a different role on a voluntary basis**	<1
	Total working in current school	11
Working in another school:	- in this role on a paid basis*	10
	- in this role but on a voluntary basis*	<1
	- in a different role on a paid basis**	10
	- in a different role on a voluntary basis**	<1
	Total working in another school	21
Not working in education and:	- doing paid work	39
	- not working at all	21
	- studying/training	5
	- doing voluntary work	<1
	- at home/housewife/househusband	<1
	- other	<1
	Total not working in education	65
Total working in education and in the same role*		10
Total working in education but not in the same role**		21

N=3261

*Single response item, with the exception of * items used to determine percentage working in education in the same role and ** used to determine percentage working in education but not in the same role*

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

2.5 Conditions of current employment

Support staff were asked to provide details about their employment, such as:

- the type of contract (i.e. whether their contract was permanent or fixed-term)
- whether they worked on a full-time¹⁴ or part-time basis (including term-time only)
- who their employer was (i.e. who paid their wages or salary)
- how they received their wages or salary (i.e. during term-time only or throughout the year).

¹⁴ Staff working 30 hours or more per week.

2.5.1 Type of contract

As can be seen in Table 2.4, most support staff said that they were employed on a permanent contract (88 per cent). One tenth said they were on a fixed-term or temporary contract and a small number (two per cent) did not know what type of contract they had.

Table 2.4 Type of contract

Response:	%
Permanent	88
Fixed-term/temporary	10
Don't know	2

N=3261

Single response item

As is clear from data presented in Table 2.5, the analysis revealed a broadly equal distribution of support staff working full-time and part-time.

Table 2.5 Full-time and part-time working

Response:	%
Part-time	52
Full-time	48

N=3261

Single response item

2.5.2 Employer

In Wave 2, staff were asked who their employer was (the definition provided was that this was the source of their wages); their responses are presented in Table 2.6 below.

Most support staff (84 per cent) said that they were employed by the local authority (LA), while 14 per cent said that they were employed by their school. One per cent of staff said that they were employed by a private company and a further one per cent did not know who their employer was.

Table 2.6 Employer (wage payer)

Response:	%
The local authority	84
The school	14
Private company (who provided a service to the school)	1
Employment agency	<1
Self-employed	<1
Other	<1
Don't know	1

N=3261

Single response

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

2.5.3 How wages were paid

In Wave 2 support staff were asked about the basis on which their wages were paid to them and the results are shown below in Table 2.7.

Nearly all staff (94 per cent) said they received payments throughout the year. Three quarters of all staff (75 per cent) received their pay throughout the year and had contracted hours during term-time only, while about a fifth of staff (19 per cent) received payments throughout the year and were contracted to work for 52 weeks a year. A small proportion of staff (five per cent) were paid only during the school term and were contracted to work term-time only.

Table 2.7 Payment of wages

Response:	%
Paid throughout the year and staff were contracted to work term-time only	75
Paid throughout the year and staff were contracted to work 52 weeks a year	19
Paid only during the school term only and staff were contracted to work term-time only	5
Don't know	1

N=3261

Single response

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Analysis also looked at how support staff were paid relating to whether they were working full-time or part-time. Findings are presented in Table 2.8 below.

Table 2.8 Payment of wages and part or full-time working

How wages were paid	% working:		N=
	full-time	part-time	
Paid throughout the year and contracted to work 52 weeks a year	69	31	608
Paid throughout the year and contracted to term-time only	43	57	2440
Paid only during the school term only and contracted to work term-time only	33	67	165
Don't know how wages were paid	35	65	48

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Analysis revealed that:

- among staff who received payment of their wages throughout the year and were contracted to work 52 weeks of the year, a higher proportion were employed on a full-time basis (69 per cent)
- among staff who received payments throughout the school year but contracted to work in term-time only, the proportions of full-time and part-time staff were more evenly distributed (43 per cent full-time compared to 57 per cent part-time)
- among staff who received payments and were contracted to work during term-time only, a lower proportion were full-time staff (33 per cent) and a higher proportion were part-time (67 per cent).

To further examine the connections between type of contract and payment of wages, analysis explored how staff said they were paid and how this related to whether they were on a permanent or a temporary contract. Table 2.9 presents the findings.

Table 2.9 Payment of wages and permanent or temporary contracts

How wages were paid	% responding contract was:		N=
	permanent	fixed/temporary	
Paid throughout the year and contracted to work 52 weeks a year	91	8	608
Paid throughout the year and contracted to work term-time only	89	10	2440
Paid only during the school term only and contracted to work term-time only	72	23	165
Don't know how wages were paid	73	21	48

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Analysis showed that:

- among staff who received payment of their wages throughout the year and were contracted to work 52 weeks of the year, the majority were on a permanent contract compared to those who were on a temporary contract (91 compared to eight per cent)
- similarly, among staff who received payments throughout the year and contracted to work term-time only, the majority were on a permanent contract compared to those who were on a temporary contract (89 compared to 10 per cent)
- among staff who were paid and contracted to work during term-time only, a much higher proportion were employed on a permanent contract compared to those who were on a temporary contract (72 compared to 23 per cent).

2.6 Length of time at current school

The questions exploring staff time at their current school and in their current role were re-drafted for Wave 2, so as to better position the study to explore correlations with responses on issues such as induction. Support staff were asked to state how long they had worked at their current school and Table 2.10 below presents the findings for this question.

Table 2.10 Length of time at current school

Response:	%
Less than 6 months	5
6 months or more, but less than a year	5
1-2 years	17
3-4 years	18
5-9 years	30
10 years or more	25

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About three quarters of support staff (73 per cent) reported that they had been at their current school for three years or more compared to about a quarter (27 per cent) who said they had worked in their current school for two years or less. The most frequently mentioned period of time was five to nine years (30 per cent), followed by a quarter of staff (25 per cent) who said that they had been at their current school for ten years or more. A tenth of staff reported that they had been at their current school for less than a year.

2.7 Length of time in current role at any school

Support staff were asked to provide information about how long they had worked in their current role, including time spent in this role at other schools. The responses to this question are shown in Table 2.11 below.

Table 2.11 Length of time in current role at any school

Response:	%
Less than 6 months	5
6 months or more, but less than a year	4
1-2 years	17
3-4 years	19
5-9 years	27
10 years or more	27

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

There was a similar pattern of responses to those reported above in relation to staff time at their current school. About three quarters of support staff (73 percent) had been in their current role, at any school, for three years or more. About a quarter of support staff (26 per cent) said they had been in their role for two years or less. Similar proportions had been in their current roles for five to nine years (27 per cent) and for ten years or more (27 per cent). About a tenth of support staff (nine per cent) reported they had been in their current role at any school for less than a year.

3. Qualifications and ICT skills

This section presents the key findings and then, in detail, reports the analysis from Section B of the support staff telephone survey (see Appendix B1). The questions in this section of the survey explored the skills and qualifications of school support staff in relation to their:

- mathematics qualifications
- English qualifications
- highest qualification
- vocational/professional qualifications
- other qualifications linked to staff's roles
- ICT skills and confidence.

Key findings about qualifications and ICT

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Three quarters of staff (75 per cent) said they had a qualification in mathematics; 54 per cent of all staff said their mathematics qualification was equivalent to, or better than level 2¹⁵.
- About four fifths of support staff (83 per cent) said they had a qualification in English; about two thirds (68 per cent) said their English qualification was equivalent to, or better than level 2.
- About half (52 per cent) of the support staff reported the highest general academic qualification they had obtained was at level 1 or 2 (or their equivalents). One fifth (20 per cent) had obtained a qualification at, or equivalent to level 3.
- About a tenth of support staff had achieved, were registered for, or were working towards the NVQ for TAs (11 per cent) and a similar proportion for Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA) status (eight per cent).
- Most support staff reported that they felt 'very' or 'fairly confident' using e-mail (84 per cent) and the internet (89 per cent), while 85 per cent said

¹⁵ The levels followed the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and are fully noted in the text that follows.

they were either ‘very’ or ‘fairly confident’ about being able to access computers when they needed to.

Regression analysis of Wave 2 responses revealed that, compared to their counterparts, the following staff were¹⁶:

- More likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2: staff who held such a qualification in English; staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3; and specialist and technical staff. The opposite was the case for staff who had been at their school for ten years or more.
- More likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2: staff who had a similar qualification in mathematics; administrative staff; and learning support staff. The opposite was the case for those aged 55 and over; staff employed by their school; and staff who had more than one role.
- More likely to have qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3: staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2; staff who had a similar qualification in mathematics; and specialist and technical staff. The opposite was the case for staff who had worked at their school for three years or more; and those who worked in schools with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals (FSM).
- Registered for, held, or were working towards a significantly higher number of vocational qualifications: teaching assistants; learning support staff; and staff with a mathematics qualification at, or equivalent to, level 2. The opposite was true for staff who had worked in their current role for ten years or more; staff aged 18-24; and male staff.
- More likely to have gained a Support Work in Schools (SWiS) qualification: staff who held, were registered for, or working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications; staff who had more than one role; and pupil support staff. The opposite was true for staff that had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3; and staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2.
- More confident about using ICT: administrative staff; teaching assistants; and specialist and technical staff. The opposite was the case for staff who had refused to provide their age; staff aged 45 or over; and staff who did not know if they had a contract.

¹⁶ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C1.3 for further information. The meaning and roles of variables, predictors and comparators (or counterparts) are explained and illustrated in full in Appendix C1.1, Table C2.1 and C3.

Regression analysis of change over time revealed that, when compared to the same groups in Wave 1:

- Staff in Wave 2 were slightly less likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2, but were more likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2.
- Staff were more confident about their use of ICT.
- Male staff; staff aged 55-64; and pupil support staff were significantly more likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2. The opposite was the case for staff on a fixed-term or temporary contract.
- Staff aged 18-24; learning support staff; and teaching assistants were significantly more likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2. The opposite was true for male staff.
- Staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2; staff aged 55-64; and staff from schools in rural areas were significantly more confident about their use of ICT. The opposite was the case for staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2; administrative staff; and staff aged 18-24.

3.1 Mathematics qualifications

Support staff were asked to provide information about whether they possessed a qualification in mathematics. Those who said they had a mathematics qualification were then asked to provide additional information about the level of qualification achieved. In cases where support staff said they did not have a mathematics qualification they were asked if they were currently working towards such a qualification. Table 3.1 below presents the findings about mathematics qualifications¹⁷.

¹⁷ Using the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) this analysis presents individuals' responses to questions B1 and B2a of the telephone survey. Level 1 qualifications are equivalent to GCSE grade D-G, so qualifications tabulated as 'Level 1 or below' consisted of CSE (any grade other than grade 1), GCSE (grade D or below), NVQ Level 1, City and Guilds (Level 1 and level unspecified), Key Skills in Application of Number Level 1, Adult Basic Skills in Numeracy Level 1, Overseas qualification, RSA (Stage 2, Stage 3 and level unspecified) and any other uncommon qualifications whose levels are hard to specify. Level 2 qualifications are equivalent to GCSE grade A*-C, consisting of O-level (pass), CSE (grade 1), GCSE (grade A*-C), Adult Basic Skills in Numeracy Level 2, Key Skills in Application of Number Level 2, Scottish Standard Grade, NVQ Level 2, AO Level and City and Guilds Level 2. Level 3 qualifications are equivalent to A-levels, consisting of AS-level, A-level/ A2-level, Adult Basic Skills in Numeracy Level 3, Key Skills in Application of Number Level 3, Scottish Higher/ Advanced Higher, Welsh Baccalaureate, International Baccalaureate, NVQ Level 3 and City and Guilds Level 3. Whilst level 6 qualifications consisted of bachelor (undergraduate) degrees and level 7 qualifications consisted of master (postgraduate) degrees and PhDs. Only the highest mathematics qualification achieved by a respondent was tabulated, so if a respondent had achieved both GCSE mathematics and

Table 3.1 Mathematics qualifications

Response:	%
Yes	75
No	25
Prefer not to say	<1
Don't know	<1

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Three quarters of support staff (75 per cent) said they had a qualification in mathematics compared with a quarter (25 per cent) who said they did not. Overall, about half of all staff (54 per cent) said they had a mathematics qualification equivalent to, or better than, level 2.

Further analysis of all responses revealed that:

- about a fifth (18 per cent) had a level 1 or below qualification in mathematics
- about half of staff (48 per cent) reported possessing a level 2 qualification in mathematics
- five per cent held a level 3 qualification in mathematics and one per cent a level six.

Additional questioning revealed that, of those support staff who said they did not have a mathematics qualification, five per cent were currently working towards gaining one. Compared to Wave 1, the proportion of staff saying that they had a mathematics qualification had increased by five percentage points.

A-level mathematics, their highest mathematics qualification would be listed as at level 3, e.g. A-level or equivalent.

3.2 English qualifications

Support staff were also asked whether they had a qualification in English (see Table 3.2 below)¹⁸.

Table 3.2 English qualifications

Response:	%
Yes	83
No	17
Prefer not to say	<1
Don't know	<1

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About four fifths of staff (83 per cent) said they had a qualification in English, compared with about a fifth who said they did not (17 per cent). Overall, about two thirds of all staff (68 per cent) said they had a qualification in English equivalent to, or better than, level 2. Further analysis of all responses revealed that:

- about a tenth (12 per cent) had a level 1 or below qualification in English
- about three fifths (58 per cent) reported possessing a level 2 qualification in English
- a tenth (10 per cent) held a level 3 qualification in English and one per cent a level six.

¹⁸ Using the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) this analysis presents individuals' responses to questions B4 and B5a of the telephone survey. Level 1 qualifications are equivalent to GCSE grade D-G, so qualifications tabulated as 'Level 1 or below' consisted of CSE (any grade other than grade 1), GCSE (grade D or below), NVQ Level 1, City and Guilds Level 1, City and Guilds (level unspecified), Key Skills in Communication Level 1, Adult Basic Skills in Literacy Level 1, Overseas qualification, RSA (Stage 2, Stage 3 and level unspecified) and any other uncommon qualifications whose levels are hard to specify. Level 2 qualifications are equivalent to GCSE grade A*-C, consisting of O-level (pass), CSE (grade 1), GCSE (grade A*-C), Adult Basic Skills in Literacy Level 2, Key Skills in Communication Level 2, Scottish Standard Grade, NVQ Level 2, AO Level and City and Guilds Level 2. Level 3 qualifications are equivalent to A-levels, consisting of AS-level, A-level/ A2-level, Adult Basic Skills in Literacy Level 3, Key Skills in Communication Level 3, Scottish Higher/ Advanced Higher, Welsh Baccalaureate, International Baccalaureate, NVQ Level 3 and City and Guilds Level 3. Whilst level 6 qualifications consisted of bachelor (undergraduate) degrees and level 7 qualifications consisted of master (postgraduate) degrees and PhDs. Only the highest English qualification achieved by a respondent was tabulated, so if a respondent had achieved both GCSE English and A-level English, their highest English qualification would be listed as at level 3, e.g. A-level or equivalent.

Additional questioning revealed that, of those who said they did not have a qualification in English, three per cent were currently working towards gaining one.

3.3 Highest academic qualification

Support staff were asked about the highest general academic qualification they had obtained. Table 3.3 below presents the findings.

Table 3.3 Highest qualification

Response:	%
O-level pass or CSE at grade 1	24
GCSE Grades A*-C	16
CSE at any other grade	9
Scottish Standard Grade	<1
GCSE Grades D-G	2
Total at levels 1 and 2	52
AS or A2/A-level	18
Scottish Higher/Advanced higher	2
Total at level 3	20
Bachelor (undergraduate degree)	11
Masters (postgraduate) degree/PhD	2
Total above level 3	14
None	14
Don't know	2

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About half of all staff (52 per cent) reported that the highest general academic qualification they had obtained was at, or equivalent to, level 2. About a quarter of support staff (24 per cent) said that their qualification was at CSE grade 1 and 16 per cent it was at GCSE O-level grades A-C¹⁹. A further fifth (20 per cent) had obtained a qualification at, or equivalent to, level 3, and 14 per cent had a qualification above level 3.

¹⁹ Equivalent to level 2.

3.4 Vocational and professional qualifications

3.4.1 Support staff vocational and/or professional qualifications

Support staff were asked if they held, were registered for, or were working towards a range of identified vocational and/or professional qualifications linked to their work as support staff. The results are presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Vocational/professional qualifications held, registered for, or being worked towards

Type of vocational qualification or status	% responding:		
	not achieved, registered for, nor working towards	achieved	registered for or working towards
NVQ for Teaching Assistants	88	9	2
Higher Level Teaching Assistant status	92	6	2
NVQ for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools	92	5	2
Support Work in Schools (SWIS) qualification	92	5	1
Foundation degree	94	4	2
Qualified Teacher Status	96	4	1
Certificate of School Business Management (CSBM)	97	2	1
Diploma of School Business Management (DSBM)	99	1	<1

N=3261

Multiple response item - percentages may not sum to 100

Responses show that:

- in relation to each of the identified vocational qualifications options provided, most support staff had not achieved, were not registered for, or were not working towards these professional or vocational qualifications (in the range 88 to 99 per cent)
- about a tenth of support staff (nine per cent) had achieved the NVQ for TAs, while a further two per cent were registered for, or were working towards, this qualification

- about a tenth (eight per cent) had achieved, were registered for, or were working towards Higher Level Teaching Assistant status
- smaller proportions of support staff said that they had achieved, were registered for, or working towards:
 - an NVQ for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools (seven per cent)
 - a Support Work in Schools (SWiS) qualification (six per cent)
 - a foundation degree (six per cent)
 - Qualified Teacher Status (five per cent).

Further questioning of support staff revealed that, of those who reported they held, were registered for, or were working towards:

- a Support Work in Schools (SWiS) qualification, about one third (34 per cent) expected to achieve or had achieved a level 3 award, certificate or diploma
- an NVQ in Support Teaching and Learning in schools, half (50 per cent) were expecting to achieve or had achieved level 3 and about a third (37 per cent) expected to achieve or had achieved level 2
- an NVQ for teaching assistants, 56 per cent expected to achieve or had achieved level 3, one third (33 per cent) were expecting to achieve or had achieved level 2 and four per cent said levels 2 and 3.

3.4.2 General vocational and/or professional qualifications

Support staff were asked if they held, were registered for, or were working towards an NVQ or NVQs in any occupation. The results are presented in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5 NVQ or NVQs in any occupation held, registered for, or being worked towards

Response:	%
Not achieved nor registered for/working towards	77
Achieved	20
Registered for/working towards	3
Don't know	1

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About three quarters of staff (77 per cent) said that they had not achieved, were not registered for, or were not working towards any other vocational or occupational qualification. One fifth of support staff (20 per cent) reported they had achieved one or more NVQs and a further three per cent reported that they were registered for, or were working towards one.

Those who reported that they had achieved, were registered for, or were working towards an NVQ were further questioned on the level they had achieved or expected to achieve. The most frequently mentioned response was level 3; 45 per cent said that they had achieved or that they expected to achieve this level. One third (33 per cent) said that they had achieved or expected to achieve level 2, a further eight per cent expected to achieve level 4 and six per cent of staff reported they had achieved or expected to achieve level 1.

3.4.3 Any qualifications relevant to role

All staff were also asked if they held, were registered for, or were working towards any other vocational or professional qualifications or statuses relevant to their role, other than those already mentioned. The results are presented in Table 3.6 below.

Table 3.6 Any other relevant vocational or professional qualifications or statuses held, registered for, or being worked towards

Response:	%
Yes	37
No	63
Don't know	1

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About three fifths of staff (63 per cent) said that they had not achieved, were not registered for, or were not working towards any other vocational or occupational qualification or status relevant to their role, other than those mentioned earlier.

3.5 ICT skills

Support staff were asked about three aspects concerning ICT: whether or not they felt confident in using email, in using the internet, and if they were able to access computers when needed for their work. Table 3.7 below presents the findings from these questions.

Table 3.7 Confidence in using and being able to access ICT

Response:	% confident about:		
	using e-mail	using the internet	being able to access computers when needed
Very confident	60	61	67
Fairly confident	24	28	18
Not very confident	9	5	3
Not at all confident	7	6	3
Do not need it for my role	-	-	10
Don't know	<1	<1	<1

N=3261

Each column reports a single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

3.5.1 Using email

Overall, most support staff (84 per cent) reported that they felt 'very' or 'fairly confident' using e-mail, with three fifths (60 per cent) reporting that they felt 'very' confident using e-mail. Only 16 per cent of support staff reported that they felt 'not very confident' or 'not at all confident' about using e-mail.

The proportion of support staff who said they were 'very confident' about using e-mail in Wave 2 had increased by 11 percentage points compared to Wave 1. Correspondingly the percentage of staff who were 'not at all confident' about using e-mail has dropped by six percentage points since Wave 1.

3.5.2 Using the internet

A slightly higher proportion of support staff were 'confident' using the internet than was the case for e-mail. About nine out of ten support staff (89 per cent) said that they felt 'very' or 'fairly confident' using the internet, with about three fifths of all staff (61 per cent) reporting that they felt 'very

confident' in this regard. About a tenth of staff (11 per cent), reported that they felt 'not very confident' or 'not at all confident' about using the internet.

As with email, comparison with the previous data reveals that the proportion of support staff who said they were 'very confident' about using the internet had increased by 10 percentage points.

3.5.3 Access to computers

Most support staff (85 per cent) said they were either 'very' or 'fairly confident' about being able to access computers when they needed to for their work, with about two thirds of all staff (67 per cent) reporting that they felt 'very confident' about such access. Six per cent reported that they felt 'not very confident' or 'not at all confident' about being able to access a computer when they needed one for their work, while a further tenth of support staff said they did not need access to a computer for their work.

3.6 Qualifications and ICT skills: Wave 2 regression analysis

Further analysis²⁰ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- qualifications in mathematics (see Appendix C3, Table C3.1)
- qualifications in English (see Appendix C3, Table C3.2)
- ICT skills (see Appendix C3, Table C3.3)
- highest academic qualifications (see Appendix C3, Table C3.4)
- vocational qualifications (see Appendix C3, Table C3.5)
- SWiS qualifications (see Appendix C3, Table C3.6).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of respondent and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.1, Table C2.1 and C3).

²⁰ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

3.6.1 Qualifications in mathematics

More likely to hold a qualification in mathematics

Analysis found that, compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2:

- staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- specialist and technical staff, administrative staff and teaching assistants
- male staff
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications.

Less likely to hold a qualification in mathematics

Analysis found that, compared to their counterparts, staff who had been at their school for ten years or more were significantly less likely to hold a mathematics qualification at, equivalent to, or better than level 2.

3.6.2 Qualifications in English

More likely to hold a qualification in English

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to have a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2:

- staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- administrative staff, learning support staff, teaching assistants, specialist and technical staff and pupil support staff
- staff aged 18-24 compared to those aged 35-44
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff from rural schools.

Less likely to hold a qualification in English

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely to have a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2:

- support staff aged 55 and over

- staff employed by their school
- staff who have more than one role
- staff from schools in the Eastern Government Office Region (GOR)
- staff from schools with a higher proportion of pupils who were entitled to free school meals.

3.6.3 Highest academic qualification

More likely to have qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to have an academic qualification at, equivalent to, or better than level 3:

- staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- specialist and technical support staff
- staff working in secondary schools
- staff from minority ethnic groups
- staff aged 18-34
- male staff
- staff working in schools in the second highest quintile of achievement
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with SEN.

Less likely to have a qualification at, equivalent to, or better than level 3

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely to have an academic qualification at, equivalent to, or better than level 3:

- staff who worked at their school for three years or more
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for FSM.

3.6.4 Vocational/professional qualifications

More vocational/professional qualifications

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups of support staff held, were registered for, or were working towards a significantly higher number of vocational qualifications:

- teaching assistants, learning support staff and pupil support staff
- staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who had worked at their school for five years or more
- staff who were employed on a full-time basis
- staff from schools in the South West
- staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who received their wages during term-time only, and their contracted hours were for term-time only
- staff who had more than one role.

Fewer vocational/professional qualifications

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups of support staff held, were registered for, or were working towards a significantly lower number of vocational qualifications:

- staff who had worked in their current role for ten years or more
- staff aged 18-24
- male staff.

3.6.5 SWiS Qualification

More likely to have a support work in schools qualification

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to hold, be registered for, or working towards a SWiS qualification:

- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff who had more than one role
- pupil support staff
- staff from schools in unitary authorities compared to those from schools in counties

- staff from medium sized schools
- staff from schools with a higher proportion of pupils eligible for FSM.

Less likely to have a support work in schools qualification

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely to hold, be registered for, or working towards a SWiS qualification:

- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2.

3.6.6 Confidence in ICT

More confidence in ICT

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups of support staff reported feeling more confident in using ICT:

- administrative staff, teaching assistants, specialist and technical staff, learning support staff and pupil support staff
- staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- male staff
- support staff who were working on a full-time basis
- staff from secondary schools
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff from rural schools
- staff who said they were employed by an organisation other than a school or local authority.

Less confidence in ICT

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups of staff reported feeling less confident in using ICT:

- staff aged 45 and over
- staff who refused to provide their age
- staff who did not know which type of contract they had
- staff from minority ethnic groups

- staff from schools in the North East
- staff who had been at their school for five to nine years.

3.7 Qualifications and ICT skills: change over time analysis

Further analysis²¹ examined change over time, between Wave 1 and Wave 2, in relation to three factors (see Appendix C1.2, Table C2.2 and C4 for a full explanation of this analysis):

- qualifications in mathematics (see Appendix C4, Table C4.1)
- qualifications in English (see Appendix C4, Table C4.2)
- ICT skills (see Appendix C4, Table C4.3).

3.7.1 Change over time and qualifications in mathematics

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that:

- overall, staff surveyed in Wave 2 were slightly less likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2 than had been the case at Wave 1
- compared to their Wave 1 counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2:
 - male staff
 - staff aged 55-64
 - pupil support staff.
- staff on a fixed-term or temporary contract were less likely to hold a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2, than had been the case for the same groups at Wave 1.

²¹ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

3.7.2 Change over time and qualifications in English

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that:

- overall, staff surveyed in Wave 2 were more likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2 than had been the case at Wave 1
- compared to their Wave 1 counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2:
 - staff aged 18-24
 - learning support staff, teaching assistants, administrative staff and pupil support staff
 - staff at schools for girls
 - staff at schools in rural areas
 - staff who had been in their role for three years or more.
- Male staff were less likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2 than had been the case for the same group at Wave 1.

3.7.3 Change over time and confidence in ICT

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that:

- overall, staff surveyed in Wave 2 were more confident in regard to ICT than had been the case at Wave 1:
- compared to their Wave 1 counterparts, the following groups were significantly more confident about their use of ICT:
 - staff who had a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
 - staff aged 55-64
 - staff from schools in rural areas.
- compared to their Wave 1 counterparts, the following groups had become less confident in regard to ICT:
 - staff who had a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
 - administrative staff
 - staff aged 18-24
 - staff from minority ethnic groups.

4. Experiences of management and performance review processes

This section presents the key findings and then detailed analysis of responses from Section C of the support staff telephone survey (see Appendix B1)²². These questions explored various aspects of line management and performance management amongst support staff, including:

- provision of guidance and support in assessing training and development needs
- whether staff had a line manager and, if so, whether this person was involved in supporting staff regarding training and development
- any performance review processes.

Key findings about experiences of management and performance review processes

Descriptive analysis showed that:

- About one third (36 per cent) of support staff identified headteachers and a similar proportion (31 per cent) identified senior teaching staff as helping them decide their training and development needs.
- Most staff (88 per cent) felt supported by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs, but a tenth did not.
- Most staff (89 per cent) received help with deciding their training and development needs, about three quarters (77 per cent) received help from one person and 12 per cent from more than one.
- About four fifths of support staff (83 per cent) said their school had a formal process or system in place through which they were able to discuss their work (representing a six point rise compared to Wave 1) and, of these staff, most (88 per cent) found the system ‘useful’.
- To apply for training and development, about half of staff (52 per cent) needed to get the permission of their headteacher, while a third needed permission from their line manager.

²² For further discussion see Section 14.1, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

Regression analysis of Wave 2 responses revealed that, compared to their counterparts, the following staff were found to²³:

- Have significantly more people supporting them in deciding their training and development needs: teaching assistants; learning support staff; and administrative staff. The opposite was the case for staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than a school or local authority; staff from secondary schools; and staff in schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL.
- Be significantly more likely to have involvement from their line managers in decisions about their training and development needs: administrative staff; teaching assistants; and learning support staff. The opposite was the case for staff who did not know who their employer was²⁴; support staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than their school or local authority; and for those on a fixed-term or temporary contract.
- Have a significantly more positive experience of management and performance review: staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications; staff employed on a full-time basis; and support staff with more than one role. The opposite was the case for support staff in secondary schools, and for specialist and technical staff.
- Feel significantly better supported by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs: administrative staff; staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications; and staff employed on a full-time basis. The opposite was the case for staff from secondary schools; staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than their school or local authority; and staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL.

Regression analysis of change over time revealed that, when compared to their counterparts in Wave 1:

- Staff in Wave 2 had a significantly lower number of people supporting them in deciding their training and development needs, but there had been no significant change in the likelihood of line management involvement in helping staff decide their training and development needs nor in how staff felt about their performance management process. However, staff were feeling significantly better supported by their schools in terms of meeting their training and development needs.

²³ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the sample numbers in the subgroups are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. For further information see Appendix C.

²⁴ The definition being that these staff did not know who paid their wages.

- Administrative staff were found to have a significantly higher number of people supporting them in deciding their training and development needs. The opposite was the case for support staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than a school or local authority; and for staff from schools with higher proportions of pupils with EAL.
- Teaching assistants were more likely to have a line manager's involvement in decisions about their training and development needs. The opposite was true for staff on a fixed-term or temporary contract.
- Staff working in the largest schools and administrative staff had a significantly more positive experience of line management and performance review, whereas, the opposite was the case for staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL.
- Staff who did not know what type of contract they had were feeling significantly better supported by their schools, in terms of meeting their training and development needs. The opposite was the case for staff from medium sized schools; staff at schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL; and staff at special schools.

4.1 Training and development needs

4.1.1 Assessing training and development needs

Support staff were asked to identify who was involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed in their role. Table 4.1 presents the findings to the two per cent level.

Table 4.1 Who is involved in identifying training and development needs

Response:	%
Headteacher	36
Other senior member of the teaching staff*	31
Senior member of support staff**	17
No-one	7
Class teacher	5
School training and development coordinator	4
Senior colleague (unspecified whether at the school)	2
Local authority staff	2
Don't know	3

N=3261

Multiple response item, but not all answers are given (see Technical Appendix)

More than one answer could be put forward, so percentages do not sum to 100

** e.g. head of department/year, deputy head ** e.g. supervisor (or equivalent) at the school*

Staff were able to provide multiple responses to this question. About one third identified headteachers (36 per cent) and a similar proportion identified senior teaching staff (31 per cent) as helping them decide their training and development needs. About one fifth (17 per cent) said that a senior member of support staff helped them decide their training and development needs, down nine percentage points compared to responses in Wave 1. Relatively small proportions of staff also identified a range of other staff who had been involved in assessing their training and development needs. Seven per cent of support staff said that no-one helped them to identify their training and development needs.

4.1.2 Supporting training and development needs

Staff were asked how supported they felt by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs. Table 4.2 presents the findings from this question²⁵.

Table 4.2 Supporting training and development needs

Response:	%
Very well supported	58
Fairly well supported	30
Not very supported	7
Not at all supported	3
I don't need/want to apply for training and development	1
Don't know	2

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Most staff (88 per cent) reported that they felt supported by their school in terms of meeting their training and development needs. About three fifths (58 per cent) said they felt 'very well supported' and about a third felt 'fairly well supported' (30 per cent), but a tenth said that they did not feel supported by their school (reporting that they were 'not very' or 'not at all' supported).

²⁵ For further discussion see Section 14.2, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

4.2 Line management

Staff were asked to identify whether anyone was involved in helping them decide what training and development they needed in their role. Table 4.3 presents these findings.

Table 4.3 The number of people that help decide what training and development is needed

Response:	%
Help from one person	77
Help from more than one person	12
No-one helps them/do not need help/don't know if help needed	11
N=3261	

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

The majority (89 per cent) of staff indicated that they received help with training and development; about three quarters (77 per cent) reported that they received help from one person and about a tenth (12 per cent) identified more than one person who helped them decide their training and development needs.

Staff who had identified one or more people were also asked if their line manager was the person or one of the people they mentioned, and Table 4.4 presents these findings.

Table 4.4 Line managers and training and development

Response:	Number of people helping:	
	one person	more than one person
Line manager is involved with training and development	78	85
Line manager is not involved with training and development	18	11
Don't have a line manager	2	3
Don't know what a line manager is	1	1
N=	2520	383

Single response items

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About three quarters (78 per cent) of the 2520 staff who reported that one person helped them decide what training and development they needed said that this was their line manager. About four fifths of the 383 staff (85 per cent) who reported that more than one person helped them said that their line manager was one of the people they mentioned.

About a fifth (18 per cent) of those who mentioned that one person helped them, and about a tenth (11 per cent) of those who said more than one person helped them, said that their line manager was not involved in helping them decide their training and development needs. Very small proportions of those who mentioned that one person helped them, and of those who said more than one person helped them, said that they did not have a line manager (two and three per cent respectively), or that they did not know what a line manager was (both groups one per cent).

To further explore the line manager connection, staff who said that they had a line manager and that their line manager was involved in helping them decide their training and development needs were also asked to name the role of their line manager. Table 4.5 shows the most frequently mentioned responses.

Table 4.5 The roles of line managers involved in training and development discussions

Response:	%
Senior member of the teaching staff	34
Headteacher	33
Senior member of support staff	20
N=2300	

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About a third of staff (34 per cent) said that their line manager was a senior member of the teaching staff, while a third (33 per cent) said they were the headteacher, and a further fifth reported that their line manager was a senior support staff colleague (20 per cent).

4.3 Performance review processes

Staff were asked if their school had a formal process or system in place through which they were able to discuss their work. Table 4.6 presents the findings.

Table 4.6 Management and performance review systems in place

Response:	%
Yes	83
No	15
Did not need/want to discuss work	<1
Don't know	2

N=3261

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About four fifths of staff (83 per cent) said their school had a formal process or system in place through which they were able to discuss their work. This was six percentage points higher than at Wave 1. Fifteen per cent of staff said that no such system or process existed for them²⁶.

Support staff who had said there was a system or process in place were then asked how useful they found this in helping to identify their training and development needs. Additional analysis revealed that, of these staff, most (88 per cent) said they found the system 'useful', with about half (55 per cent) saying that they had found it 'very useful' and a third (33 per cent) reporting that it had been 'fairly useful'. However, about a tenth (nine per cent) of staff reported that they had not found the system useful.

Staff were also asked who they needed to get permission from in order to apply for training and development. About half (52 per cent) said they needed permission from their headteacher, while a third (33 per cent) reported that they needed permission from their line manager. A further 15 per cent said that they needed the permission of another senior member of the teaching staff.

²⁶ The response to this question related to the experience of the individual member of staff providing an answer. Therefore, it may be that the respondent's school does not have a process or system in place for them, but may have a system for other categories of staff.

4.4 Experiences of management: Wave 2 regression analysis

Further analysis²⁷ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- the number of staff involved in deciding training and development (see Appendix C3, Table C3.7)
- having a line manager involved in training and development (see Appendix C3, Table C3.8)
- experience of management and performance reviews (see Appendix C3, Table C3.9)
- level of support in meeting training and development needs (see Appendix C3, Table C3.10).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of staff and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.1, Table C2.1 and C3).

4.4.1 The number of staff involved in deciding training and development

More staff involved in deciding training and development

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to have significantly more staff involved in helping them decide their training and development needs: teaching assistants; learning support staff; administrative staff; pupil support staff; and specialist and technical staff.

Fewer staff involved in deciding training and development

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to have significantly fewer staff involved in helping them decide their training and development needs:

- support staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than a school or local authority
- staff from secondary schools
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL

²⁷ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

- staff aged 65 or over
- staff who did not know how they were paid
- staff from schools in the middle quintile of achievement.

4.4.2 Having a line manager involved in training and development

More likely to have line manager involved

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to have the involvement of line managers in decisions about their training and development needs:

- administrative staff, teaching assistants and learning support staff
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- staff who receive payments all year and have contracted hours for 52 weeks of the year
- support staff with more than one role
- support staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2.

Less likely to have line manager involved

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely to have the involvement of line managers in decisions about their training and development needs:

- staff who did not know in what way their wages were paid
- staff who did not know who their employer was²⁸
- staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than a school or local authority
- those on a fixed-term or temporary contract
- staff from special schools
- staff who had worked in their current role for ten years or more
- staff who worked in schools with a higher proportion of pupils with EAL.

²⁸ The definition being that these staff did not know who paid their wages.

4.4.3 Experience of line management and performance review processes

More positive experience of performance review process

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to have a significantly more positive experience of their line management and performance review processes:

- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- staff with more than one role.

Less positive experience of performance review process

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to have a significantly less positive experience of their line management and performance review processes:

- staff from secondary schools
- specialist and technical staff
- staff from mid-sized schools
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff who said that they could not read and/or write English to the standard required for their role
- staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than a school or local authority
- staff from schools in the Yorkshire and Humber GOR
- staff from schools with a higher proportion of pupils with EAL.

4.4.4 Satisfaction with school support for meeting training and development needs

Higher satisfaction with school support

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported feeling significantly better supported, by their school, in terms of meeting their training and development needs:

- administrative staff
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff employed on a full-time basis

- staff with more than one role
- staff aged 55-64
- staff from schools in rural areas.

Lower satisfaction with school support

The following groups reported feeling significantly less well supported, by their school, in terms of meeting their training and development needs:

- staff from secondary schools compared to those in primary schools
- staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than their school or local authority
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with SEN
- specialist and technical staff compared to site staff
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3 compared to those who did not
- staff in mid-sized schools compared to those in the smallest schools.

4.5 Experiences of management: change over time analysis

Further analysis²⁹ examined change over time, between Wave 1 and Wave 2, in relation to four factors (see Appendix C1.2, Table C2.2 and C4 for a full explanation of this analysis):

- the number of staff involved in deciding training and development (see Appendix C4, Table C4.4)
- having a line manager involved in training and development (see Appendix C4, Table C4.5)
- experience of management and performance reviews (see Appendix C4, Table C4.6)
- level of support in meeting training and development needs (see Appendix C4, Table C4.7).

²⁹ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

4.5.1 The number of staff involved in deciding training and development

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, staff surveyed in Wave 2 were found to have a significantly lower number of people supporting them in deciding their training and development needs
- administrative staff were found to have a significantly higher number of people supporting them in deciding their training and development needs
- staff who said that they were employed by an employer other than a school or local authority, and those from schools with higher proportions of pupils with EAL, were found to have a significantly lower number of people supporting them in deciding their training and development needs.

4.5.2 Having a line manager involved in training and development

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant difference in relation to whether support staff were significantly more or less likely to have a line manager's involvement in decisions about their training and development needs
- teaching assistants were more likely to have a line manager's involvement in decisions about their training and development
- staff on a fixed-term or temporary contract were less likely to have a line manager involved in decisions about their training and development needs.

4.5.3 Experience of line management and performance review processes

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant difference in relation to whether support staff were significantly more or less positive about their experience of line management and performance review processes
- staff working in the largest schools and administrative staff were found to have a significantly more positive experience of line management and performance review processes
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL were found to have a significantly less positive experience of line management and performance review processes.

4.5.4 Satisfaction with school support for meeting training and development needs

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, staff were feeling significantly better supported by their schools, in terms of meeting their training and development needs.
- staff who did not know what type of contract they had were feeling significantly better supported by their schools in terms of meeting their training and development needs
- staff from the following groups were feeling significantly less well supported, by their school, in terms of meeting their training and development needs:
 - staff at medium sized schools
 - staff at schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL
 - staff at special schools.

5. Motivation, barriers and information needs

This section presents the key findings and then in detail reports analysis of responses from Section D of the telephone survey (see Appendix B1). The questions in Section D explored support staff perceptions and awareness of training and development opportunities. These included:

- motivational factors in training and development
- barriers to training and development
- access to information about training and development.

Key findings about motivation, barriers and information needs

Descriptive analysis showed that:

- About three quarters (72 per cent) of support staff said training and development that would help them carry out their current role was a very important motivation to undertake training and about three fifths (62 per cent) said the same about self-development and increased job satisfaction.
- About a third of staff (34 per cent) said that nothing got in the way of them taking part in training and development, but about three fifths (62 per cent) identified a range of barriers.
- Schools and local authorities were the organisations most frequently mentioned as sources of information on training and development (30 and 25 per cent respectively), but about a quarter of support staff (24 per cent) said they did not know where to access such information.

Regression analysis of Wave 2 responses revealed that compared to their counterparts, the following were found to³⁰:

- Place a significantly greater importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training: staff who were employed on a full-time basis; staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher

³⁰ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

number of vocational qualifications; and staff from minority ethnic groups. The opposite was the case for staff aged 45 and over; and specialist and technical staff.

- Place a significantly greater importance on career development as a reason to undertake training: staff employed on a full-time basis; staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications; and staff aged 18-34. The opposite was the case for staff aged 45 and over; staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3; and staff who had been at their school for ten years or more.
- Identify a significantly greater number of barriers to taking part in training and development: teaching assistants; and specialist and technical staff. The opposite was the case for staff in the age bands 18-24 and 55-64; and staff from minority ethnic groups.
- Use a significantly greater number of sources to access information about training and development: support staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2; staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications; and staff who had their wages paid throughout the year. The opposite was the case for staff aged 18-34; staff who did not know who their employer was³¹; and support staff working in medium sized schools.
- Be more likely to use local sources of information: support staff from schools in rural areas; support staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2; and staff who had been in their current role for ten years or more. The opposite was the case for staff aged 18-34; and specialist and technical staff.
- Be more likely to use government³² sources of information: administrative staff; staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3; and staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications. The opposite was the case for pupil support staff; and staff who had been in their current role for five years or more.
- Be more likely to use 'other' sources of information: specialist and technical staff. The opposite was the case for staff from schools in rural areas.

Regression analysis of change over time revealed that, when compared to their counterparts in Wave 1:

³¹ The definition being that these staff did not know who paid their wages.

³² Sources included were Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC), Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)/ Department for Education and Skills (DfES), Learning and Skills Council (LSC), National College for School Leadership (NCSL), Ofsted, Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA), Sector Skills Development Agency (SSDA) and the TDA.

- Overall, there was no significant difference in relation to the importance support staff placed on personal development nor on career development as reasons to undertake training, and the same was true regarding the number of barriers faced by support staff when they wanted to take up a training and development opportunity.
- Staff from schools in metropolitan authorities placed significantly more importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training than had been the case at Wave 1.

5.1 Reasons for selecting training and development

Support staff were provided with a list of possible reasons influential in their decision to take part in training and development. Staff were asked how important each reason was to them. Table 5.1 presents the findings³³.

Table 5.1 Possible reasons to take up training and development

Response:	Very important	Fairly important	Not very important	Not at all important	Don't need/want	Don't know
To provide support in carrying out current role	72	21	3	2	1	<1
To help with self-development	62	30	4	2	1	<1
To increase job satisfaction	62	29	5	2	1	<1
To take on greater responsibilities	43	38	10	5	2	<1
To help with career progression in current role	46	31	13	7	4	<1
To achieve higher pay	43	33	14	7	2	1
To enable a move into a different job	31	31	21	12	4	1

N=3261

A series of single response items

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About three fifths or more of staff rated all of the possible reasons for taking part in training as 'very' or 'fairly important' (in the range 62 to 94 per cent). Specifically:

- about nine in ten staff said that 'to provide support in carrying out current role', 'to help with self-development' and 'to increase job satisfaction' (93, 92 and 91 per cent respectively) were 'very' or 'fairly important' reasons for taking part in training

³³ For further discussion see Section 14.3, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

- about three quarters or more of staff said that ‘to take on greater responsibilities’, ‘to help with career progression in their current role’ and ‘to achieve higher pay’ (81, 77 and 76 per cent respectively) were ‘very’ or ‘fairly important’ reasons for taking part in training
- ‘to enable a move into a different job’ was the factor which the lowest proportions of staff thought was ‘very’ or ‘fairly important’ (62 per cent)
- a lower percentage of staff thought that ‘to take on greater responsibilities’, ‘to help with career progression in their current role’ and ‘to achieve higher pay’ (15, 20 and 21 per cent respectively) were ‘not very’ or were ‘not at all’ important as reasons for taking part in training and a third (33 per cent) thought the same about ‘to enable a move into a different job’.

Responses suggest that career progression, enabling a move into a different job and increases in pay were somewhat less important to most support staff in influencing their decisions to undertake training and development.

5.2 Barriers to training and development

Support staff were asked to identify what got in the way of them taking part in training and development, and Table 5.2 shows the barriers identified by staff in answer to this open-ended question³⁴.

Table 5.2 Barriers to training and development

Response:	%
Other commitments/demands on time get in the way	36
Nothing gets in the way of training	34
Lack of funding for training	14
Difficult personal circumstances	4
Staffing levels/cover	3
Did not know what was available	2
Lack of encouragement from line manager	2
Travel/transport difficulties	2
Too old/close to retirement	2
Did not need or want training	2
Don't know	2

N=3261

Multiple response item

More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100

³⁴ For further discussion see Section 14.6, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

About three fifths of staff (62 per cent) mentioned at least one thing that got in the way of them taking part in training and development, while most of the remaining staff, about a third of all staff (34 per cent), said that they did not feel that anything had got in the way of them taking part in training and development. Overall, about half of all staff (53 per cent) mentioned one thing that gets in the way and nine per cent mentioned more than one.

The most frequently cited barrier to taking part in training and development, mentioned by about a third of support staff (36 per cent), was ‘other commitments and demands on time’. ‘Lack of funding’ was also identified as a barrier by 14 per cent of support staff. Smaller proportions of staff mentioned a range of other factors that they said got in the way of them taking part in training and development, such as ‘personal circumstances’ and ‘staffing levels/cover’.

5.3 Information about training and development

Support staff were asked which organisations they would use if they wanted to access information about training and development, and Table 5.3 presents the findings³⁵.

Table 5.3 Sources of information used in relation to training and development

Response:	%
My school	30
Local authority	25
Don't know	24
A college or university	6
Internet (unspecified organisation/site)	6
Their employer	3
A private training provider	3
Would not look for/don't need information	3
TDA	2

N=3261

Multiple response item

Only responses at or above the two per cent level have been reported in this table

More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100

³⁵ Due to the numbers of staff responding, only responses at or above the two per cent level are reported.

Staff mentioned a range of sources that they would contact if they wanted information on training and development, but about a quarter of support staff (24 per cent) said they did not know where to access this information and a further three per cent said they would not look for such information or did not need it. About a third of all staff (30 per cent) said they would access information via their school and about a quarter (25 per cent) mentioned local authorities. Smaller proportions said they would access information from a college or university (six per cent), from their employer (three per cent), from a private training provider (three per cent) and two per cent mentioned the TDA.

Support staff were also asked, using a number of pre-determined responses, how they would prefer to receive information about training and development, and Table 5.4 presents the findings.

Table 5.4 Preferred format for accessing and/or receiving training and development information

Response:	%
Printed material (e.g. flyers, brochures)	53
E-mail	37
Online/internet	7
None of the options provided	1
Do not want to receive information	1
Don't know	2

N=3261

A series of single response items

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Printed material and e-mail were the most frequently cited preferred formats for receiving information about training and development (53 and 37 per cent respectively), while the internet was mentioned by a smaller proportion of staff (seven per cent).

5.4 Motivation, barriers and information needs: Wave 2 regression analysis

Further analysis³⁶ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- personal development (see Appendix C3, Table C3.11)
- career development (see Appendix C3, Table C3.12)
- barriers to personal development (Appendix C3, Table C3.13)
- the number of sources of information on training and development (Appendix C3, Table C3.14)
- the types of sources of information on training and development (Appendix C3, Table C3.15, C3.16 and C3.17).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of staff and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.1, C2 Table 2.1 and C3).

5.4.1 Personal development as a reason for taking part in training and development

More importance placed on personal development

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed significantly greater importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training:

- staff who were employed on a full-time basis
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff from minority ethnic groups
- learning support staff
- staff from special schools
- staff from schools in metropolitan authorities
- staff with more than one role.

³⁶ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

Less importance placed on personal development

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed significantly less importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training:

- staff aged 45 and over
- specialist and technical staff
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3.

5.4.2 Career development as a reason for taking part in training and development**More importance placed on career development**

Compared to their counterparts, the following placed a significantly greater importance on career development as a reason to undertake training:

- staff employed on a full-time basis
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff aged 18-34
- staff from minority ethnic groups
- staff from schools in metropolitan authorities
- staff from schools in the East Midlands GOR.

Less importance placed on career development

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed significantly less importance on career development as a reason to undertake training:

- staff aged 45 and over
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff who had been at their school for ten years or more
- staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- male staff
- specialist and technical staff.

5.4.3 Barriers to taking part in training and development

A larger number of barriers

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups identified a significantly greater number of barriers to taking part in training and development:

- teaching assistants, specialist and technical staff, learning support staff, pupil support staff and administrative staff
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff from secondary schools
- staff who said that they could not read and/or write English to the standard required for their role
- staff from schools in the South West GOR
- those who had worked at their school for three to four years.

Smaller number of barriers

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported significantly fewer barriers to taking part in training and development:

- staff in the age bands 18-24 and 55-64
- staff from minority ethnic groups
- staff who did not know how they received their wages
- staff from schools in the East Midlands GOR.

5.4.4 The number of sources of information about training and development used by support staff

More information sources used

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups said they would use a significantly greater number of sources to access information about training and development:

- staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff who had their wages paid throughout the year and were contracted for 52 weeks of the year
- staff who refused to provide their age.

Fewer information sources used

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups said they would use significantly fewer information sources to access information about training and development:

- staff aged 18-34
- staff who did not know who their employer was³⁷
- staff who were employed by their school
- staff from medium sized schools.

5.4.5 Local sources of information about training and development

More likely to be using local sources of information

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to use local sources to access information about training and development:

- staff from schools in rural areas
- staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who had been in their current role for ten years or more.

Less likely to be using local sources of information

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely to use local sources to access information about training and development:

- staff aged 18-34 years
- specialist and technical staff
- staff who did not know who their employer was³⁷, staff not employed by a school or local authority, and those employed by their school
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff from secondary schools
- staff from medium sized schools.

³⁷ The definition being that these staff did not know who paid their wages.

5.4.6 Government sources of information about training and development

More likely to be using government sources of information

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to make use of government sources to access information about training and development:

- administrative staff
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- those aged 45-54.

Less likely to be using government sources of information

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely to make use of government sources to access information about training and development:

- pupil support staff
- staff who had been in their current role for five years or more.

5.4.7 Sources of information other than local or those from government

More likely to be using 'other' sources of information

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely to use sources other than those at a local or governmental level to access information about training and development:

- specialist and technical staff
- staff who receive their payments only during term-time and had contracted hours during term-time
- staff who had their wages paid throughout the year and were contracted for 52 weeks a year
- staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff from secondary schools
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3

- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications.

Less likely to be using 'other' sources of information

Compared to their counterparts, staff from schools in rural areas were less likely to use sources other than those at a local or governmental level to access information about training and development.

5.5 Motivation, barriers and information needs: change over time analysis

Further analysis examined change over time, between Wave 1 and Wave 2, in relation to three factors (see in Appendix C1.2, C2 and C4 for a full explanation of this analysis):

- personal development (see Appendix C4, Table C4.8)
- career development (see Appendix C4, Table C4.9)
- barriers to personal development (Appendix C4, Table C4.10).

5.5.1 Personal development as a reason for taking part in training and development

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant difference in relation to the importance support staff placed on personal development as a reason to undertake training
- staff from schools in metropolitan authorities placed significantly more importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training.

5.5.2 Career development as a reason for taking part in training and development

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that overall there was no significant difference in relation to the importance all groups of support staff placed on career development as a reason to undertake training.

5.5.3 Barriers to taking part in training and development regression

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that overall there was no significant difference in relation to the numbers of barriers faced by all groups of support staff.

6. Experiences of training and development

This section presents the key findings and then in detail reports analysis relating to experiences of training and development. It also includes the responses to questions in Section E of the telephone survey (see Appendix B1). Support staff were asked about:

- their induction for their current role, and any assessment of their professional development needs
- the focus of any professional development or training received in the past year
- the focus, location and provider of their most recent training undertaken as part of their specified role
- whether this training was leading to a formal qualification or status, and if so what this was.

Key findings about training and development

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Most staff said that they had experienced a range of induction-related activity, such as being provided with a ‘job description’ (90 per cent), as well as ‘information about the school procedures’ and a ‘tour of the school site and facilities’ (85 and 78 per cent).
- Three quarters of staff (75 per cent) reported having received some training or professional development relating to their ‘current specified role’ in the past 12 months; about three fifths of all staff (58 per cent) said they had participated in more than one piece of such training.
- In the last twelve months, about half (54 per cent) had received training aimed at developing ‘role-related skills and knowledge’. Half had received training on ‘safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection’.
- About a quarter of staff (26 per cent) said that the focus of recent training had been on ‘safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection’ and about a fifth said ‘role-related skills’ (this response being 10 percentage points down compared to Wave 1).

- The most frequently cited location of recent training and development was staff's 'own school' (63 per cent). 'Local authority premises' were also mentioned as a location for training by 16 per cent of staff.
- The most frequently cited training providers were 'local authority staff', mentioned by about a third of staff (34 per cent). A quarter of staff (25 per cent) said that their training had been provided by 'staff from their own school'.
- Fourteen per cent of staff said that their training had led (or would lead) to some form of qualification or status, and most of these (92 per cent) had either gained that qualification or status or expected to do so.

Regression analysis of Wave 2 responses revealed that compared to their counterparts the following staff were found to³⁸:

- Have experienced significantly more activities associated with induction: staff who had been in their current role for five years or more; staff employed on a full-time basis; and learning support staff. The opposite was the case for staff who have been in their school for 5 years or more; staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL; and staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3.
- Be significantly more likely not to have had any training/development in the last 12 months: staff aged 65 years or more; those aged 25-34; and staff who did not know how their wages were paid. The opposite was the case for learning support staff; teaching assistants; and pupil support staff.
- Have participated in significantly more pupil-focused training and development opportunities: teaching assistants; learning support staff; and pupil support staff. The opposite was the case for staff in medium sized schools.

Regression analysis of change over time revealed that, when compared to their counterparts in Wave 1:

- Overall, there was no significant difference in relation to the number of induction activities experienced by staff, nor in relation to whether or not staff had experienced any type of training in the previous 12 months. This was also true in relation to the amount of pupil-focused training that had been experienced by staff over the previous twelve months.
- Staff at schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL and staff who were employed by an organisation other than their school or a local

³⁸ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

authority had experienced significantly fewer induction activities, than had been the case at Wave 1.

- Staff aged 25-34 and staff from secondary schools were significantly more likely not to have had any training in the last 12 months than had been the case at Wave 1. The opposite was true for staff employed on a full-time basis and pupil support staff.
- Staff from schools in the highest and second highest quintiles of achievement, and staff who had worked in their current role for two years or more, had experienced significantly more pupil-focused training than had been the case at Wave 1.

6.1 Induction for current role

Initially, support staff were asked to consider their experiences upon first starting work in their current role. Their responses are presented in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Induction into current role

Response:	%
Given a job description	90
Information about school procedures, for example fire drills	85
Tour of the school site and facilities	78
Introduction to school policies, for example behaviour management	72
Introduction to the pupils they would be working with	68
Given opportunity to discuss training and development needs	67
Introduced to line manager (only asked of those with a line manager)	59*
Don't know	<1

*N=3261, apart from * when N=1931*

Multiple response item (percentage only presented for 'yes' responses)

More than one answer could be put forward, so percentages do not sum to 100

Most staff said that when they started in their current role they were 'given a job description' and 'information about school procedures' (90 and 85 per cent respectively). About three quarters of staff said they were given 'a tour of the school' and 'an introduction to school policies' (78 and 72 per cent). Slightly smaller proportions were introduced to pupils and given an opportunity to discuss their training and development needs, about two thirds in each case (68 and 67 per cent respectively). The proportion responding that they had been given 'an opportunity to discuss their training and development needs' had risen by six percentage points compared to Wave 1.

Of the 2,300 staff who said that they had a line manager, about three fifths (59 per cent) said they had been ‘introduced to this line manager’ when they had started in their current role, which was 25 percentage points lower than the same response at Wave 1.

6.2 Training and development in the past 12 months

Staff were asked whether they had received any training and development on a series of pre-determined topics in the preceding 12 months, in relation to their specified role (see question E2, Appendix B1). Staff were also asked whether this training had been completed or whether it was still ongoing and the results are presented in Table 6.2 below³⁹.

Table 6.2 The focus of training and development in the past 12 months

Response:	%
Role-related skills and knowledge	54
Promoting safety and welfare/child protection	50
Managing behaviour/discipline	35
Working with children with SEN	35
Supporting specific subject/key stage skills/knowledge	31
Improving own skills	27
Integrated/multi-agency working	15
No training relating to specified role in past 12 months	25

N=3261

A series of single response items, percentage only presented for ‘yes’ responses

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Overall, three quarters of staff (75 per cent) reported that they had received some training or professional development relating to ‘their current specified role’ in the past 12 months. About three fifths of all staff (58 per cent) said they had participated in more than one piece of such training and about a fifth in just one session (17 per cent).

³⁹ For further discussion see Section 14.5, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

Of those who had received training, about half (54 per cent) said that they had experienced training focused on ‘developing role-related skills and knowledge’ (this was up 10 percentage points compared to Wave 1 responses) and half (50 per cent) had also received training on ‘safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection’. Smaller proportions of staff said that they had received training aimed at ‘behaviour management’, ‘working with children with SEN’ and supporting ‘specific subject/key stage skills/knowledge’, with about a third mentioning these types of training (35, 35 and 31 per cent respectively). About a quarter of staff (27 per cent) said that the focus of recent training had been on ‘improving their own skills’ and a smaller percentage (15 per cent) said that they had received training in ‘multi agency working’.

6.3 Focus, location and provider of most recent training

Support staff who reported that they had attended training relating to one of the areas specified in the previous twelve months were also asked to give some more details regarding the most recent training and development they had received (see questions E3/E4b/E5/E6, Appendix B1). This included information about:

- the focus of the training
- where the training course or event had taken (or was taking) place
- the provider of the training.

6.3.1 The type and status of the most recent training

The type of the most recent training

In order to further explore experiences of training, the 1,898 staff who had mentioned receiving more than one example of training were asked to provide details of their most recent training⁴⁰. The focus of their most recent training can be seen in Table 6.3.

⁴⁰ For further discussion see Section 14.5, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

Table 6.3 The type of the most recent training

Type of training	%
Promoting safety and welfare/child protection	26
Role-related skills and knowledge (e.g. ICT)	19
Managing behaviour/discipline	17
Working with children with SEN	12
Improving own skills	9
Supporting specific subject/key stage skills/knowledge	9
Integrated/multi-agency working	2
Did not know the focus of recent training	4
None of the above	2
N=1898	

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Of those who had received one or more examples of training:

- the most frequently cited example of recent training was ‘safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection’, mentioned by about a quarter of staff (26 per cent)
- about a fifth of staff said that their most recent training had been in ‘role-related skills and knowledge’ (19 per cent) and in ‘managing pupil behaviour’ (17 per cent)
- about a tenth of staff mentioned training focused on ‘working with children with special educational needs’, ‘improving their own skills’ and ‘supporting specific subject/key stage skills/knowledge’ (12, nine and nine per cent respectively)
- a small proportion of staff (two per cent) said that the focus of their most recent training had been on ‘multi-agency working’, while four per cent of staff did not know what the focus of recent training had been
- a further two per cent said that their most recent their training had not focused on any of the pre-determined areas provided.

The status of the most recent training

Staff who had received training were also asked if their training had been completed⁴¹. Findings are presented in Table 6.4 below.

⁴¹ Staff who had mentioned more than one example of training were asked this question in relation to their most recent training.

Table 6.4 The status of training

Response:	% responding:		
	overall	one example of training	more than one example of training
Completed	59	54	60
Ongoing	41	45	39
N=	2346	564	1782

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Overall, 59 per cent said that their training had been completed and about two fifths (41 per cent) said that it was still ongoing. There was a broadly equal distribution of responses from those who had mentioned just having one example of training in the last twelve months and from those who had mentioned more than one example.

6.3.2 The location of the most recent training

Staff who had received training were also asked where this had taken place⁴². A pre-determined list of possible venues was provided, but staff were also able to provide their own description of venues. The most frequent responses to this question can be seen in Table 6.5 below.

The location most frequently cited by support staff of recent training and development was their ‘own school’, mentioned by two thirds of staff (66 per cent). In addition:

- about two fifths of staff (43 per cent) said that the training at their school had been conducted as part of ‘in-service training (INSET)’
- a fifth (20 per cent) who had also received their most recent training at their school said that it had ‘not been part of INSET’
- sixteen per cent mentioned ‘local authority premises’ as the venue for their most recent training, while smaller proportions of staff mentioned a range of other locations, such as ‘other schools’, a ‘college/university’, ‘hotels’, ‘training providers’ premises’ and ‘training and development centres’ (in the range seven to one per cent).

⁴² Staff who had mentioned more than one example of training were asked this question in relation to their most recent training.

Table 6.5 Location of most recent training or professional development

Response:	%
At their school (in INSET time)	43
At their school (in non-INSET time)	20
At a local authority's premises/office	16
At another school	7
At a college/university	5
At their school (did not know if in INSET time)	3
At a hotel	4
At an external training provider's premises	2
At a training/development centre	2
Outside of their school (off site, unspecified)	1
Don't know	1
N=2346	

Multiple response item

More than one answer could be put forward so percentages do not sum to 100

6.3.3 The providers of the recent training

Staff who had received training were also asked to identify which organisations (or individuals) had run their most recent training, and responses are presented in Table 6.6⁴³.

The most frequently identified provider of recent training and development, was 'local authority staff', mentioned by about a third of staff (34 per cent), and:

- about a quarter (26 per cent) said that their most recent training had been provided by an organisation (or individual) from a 'provider/organisation other than their school or LA'
- about a fifth (17 per cent) said that another member of the 'teaching staff at their school' had delivered their most recent training
- eight per cent reported that they had received their most recent training from another member of the 'support staff at their school' and seven per cent reported that their training had been provided by their line manager

⁴³ Staff who had mentioned more than one example of training, were asked this question in relation to their most recent training.

- smaller proportions of staff mentioned a range of other providers, such as ‘staff from a college or university’, a member of ‘teaching staff from another school’, a member of ‘support staff from another school’ or their ‘learning coach or mentor’ (in the range three to one per cent).

Table 6.6 Provider of most recent training and development

Response:	%
Staff from a local authority	34
A provider/organisation other than their school or LA	26
Another member of teaching staff at your school	17
Another member of support staff at your school	8
Your line manager	7
Staff from a college/university	3
A member of teaching staff from another school	2
A member of support staff from another school	1
A learning coach or mentor	1
Other	1
Don't know	8
N=2346	

Multiple response item

More than one answer could be put forward, so percentages do not sum to 100

6.4 Training for qualification or status

Staff who had received training were asked if their most recent training was intended to lead to a formal qualification or to a change in status⁴⁴. Those who said that their most recent training had or would contribute towards a qualification or status were also asked whether they had achieved this (or in the case of ongoing training whether they expected to achieve it). Responses are presented in Table 6.7.

⁴⁴ Staff who had mentioned more than one example of training were asked this question in relation to their most recent training.

Table 6.7 Outcomes of training: achievement of qualifications and status

Response:	% responding:			N=
	yes	no	don't know	
Training had led or would lead to formal qualifications/status	14	84	3	2346
Had achieved or expected to achieve the qualification/status*	92	6	2	318

* Of those whose training led to qualification/status

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Most staff (84 per cent) said their recent training had not led or would not lead to a formal qualification/status, while fourteen per cent said that it had or would. Slightly higher proportions of all staff said that their most recent training had led or would lead to 'formal qualifications' or 'certificates' (four per cent in each case) than was the case for those mentioning 'formal status' (one per cent) and within these a wide range of different types of qualifications/statuses were reported, for instance:

- an NVQ level 2, NVQ level 3 or unspecified NVQ level, which were the most frequently cited in the formal qualifications categories
- HLTA, which was the most cited in the formal status category
- a certificate in School Business Management (and related), a certificate (unspecified) and certificate 'other', which were the most frequently cited in the certificate category
- a first aid qualification, which was the most frequently cited response in the 'other' category.

As Table 6.7 shows, of the 318 staff who said that their most recent training had led or would lead to a formal qualification or status, 92 per cent had already gained or expected to gain this.

6.5 Experiences of training and development: Wave 2 regression analysis

Further analysis⁴⁵ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- the number of inductions activities experienced (Appendix C3, Table C3.18)
- any training in a twelve-month period prior to the time of being surveyed (Appendix C3, Table C3.19)
- participation in ‘pupil-focused’ training in the past 12 months (Appendix C3, Table C3.20).

A regression analysis was then conducted to identify the patterns of responses related to specific groups of staff (for further explanation see Appendix C1.1, C2, Table C2.1 and C3).

6.5.1 Activities associated with induction

More activities associated with induction

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups experienced significantly more activities associated with induction:

- staff who had been in their current role for five years or more
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- learning support staff and teaching assistants
- staff aged 18-34
- staff from minority ethnic groups
- staff from schools offering a greater number of extended services
- staff with more than one role
- staff from schools in rural areas.

⁴⁵ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

Fewer activities associated with induction

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups experienced significantly fewer activities associated with induction:

- staff who had been in their school for 5 years or more
- staff from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff employed by an organisation other than a school or a local authority
- staff from secondary schools
- specialist and technical staff
- staff who were paid during term-time only and have contracted hours during term-time only
- staff who did not know how they were paid
- staff who did not know who their employer was⁴⁶
- staff aged 45-54
- staff working in medium sized schools.

6.5.2 Any training in the last 12 months

More likely not to have had any training

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly more likely not to have had any training/development in the last 12 months:

- staff aged 65 and over and those aged 25-34
- those who did not know how their wages were paid
- staff from secondary schools.

Less likely not to have had any training

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were significantly less likely not to have had any training/development in the last 12 months:

- learning support staff, teaching assistants, pupil support staff and administrative staff
- staff from special schools
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- support staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2

⁴⁶ The definition being that these staff did not know who paid their wages.

- staff who had worked in their school for three to four years
- staff from schools in rural areas
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff from schools offering a greater number of extended services.

6.5.3 Pupil-focused training in the past 12 months

More pupil-focused training

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to have participated in significantly more pupil-focused training and development opportunities:

- teaching assistants, learning support staff, pupil support staff, specialist and technical staff and administrative staff
- staff from special schools
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- staff who had been at their school for ten years or more
- staff aged 18-24.

Less pupil-focused training

Compared to their counterparts, support staff in medium sized schools had received significantly less pupil-focused training.

6.6 Experiences of training and development: change over time analysis

Further analysis⁴⁷ examined change over time, between Wave 1 and Wave 2, in relation to three factors:

- the number of induction activities (Appendix C4, Table C4.11)
- any training in a twelve-month period prior to the time of being surveyed (Appendix C4, Table C4.12)

⁴⁷ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

- participation in ‘pupil-focused’ training in the past 12 months (Appendix C4, Table C3.13).

A regression analysis was then conducted to identify the patterns of responses related to specific groups of staff (for further explanation see Appendix C1.2, C2, Table C2.2 and C4).

6.6.1 Types of activity associated with induction

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant difference in relation to the number of induction activities experienced by staff at Wave 2
- staff from the following groups experienced significantly fewer induction activities:
 - staff at schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL
 - staff who were employed by an organisation other than their school or a local authority.

6.6.2 Any training in the last 12 months

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant difference in relation to whether staff had or had not experienced any type of training in the previous 12 months
- staff from the following groups were significantly more likely not to have had any training in the last 12 months:
 - staff aged 25-34
 - staff at secondary schools.
- staff from the following groups were significantly less likely not to have had any training in the last 12 months:
 - staff employed on a full-time basis
 - pupil support staff.

6.6.3 Pupil-focused training in the past 12 months

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant difference in relation to the amount of pupil-focused training that had been experienced by staff over the previous twelve months
- staff from the following groups had experienced significantly more pupil-focused training:
 - staff from schools in the highest and second highest quintiles of achievement
 - staff who had worked in their current school for two years or more.

7. Satisfaction with training and development

This section presents the key findings and then in detail reports analysis of findings from Section E of the telephone survey (see Appendix B1). These questions explored school support staff satisfaction with their most recent training and development, related to its quality, its relevance to meeting needs, its benefits and support staff preferences regarding the location of training and development⁴⁸.

Key findings about satisfaction with training and development

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Nearly all (96 per cent) of staff reported the quality of their most recent training as good, with about three fifths of all staff rating it as ‘very good’ (58 per cent).
- About half of staff (53 per cent) said that the training and development they had received in the last twelve months had helped support them in ‘carrying out their role’ and 15 per cent thought that it had ‘improved outcomes for children’.

Regression analysis of Wave 2 responses revealed that, compared to their counterparts, the following staff were found to⁴⁹:

- Perceive a significantly greater number of benefits from their recent training and development: staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications; staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3; and staff from schools in the middle quintile of achievement. The opposite was the case for staff from the largest schools; and specialist and technical staff.

⁴⁸ For further discussion see Section 14.4, which brings together findings from the staff survey with those from the leaders survey.

⁴⁹ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. A full explanation of this analysis is provided in Appendix C.

- Express significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their most recent training/development and its perceived relevance: teaching assistants; learning support staff; and administrative staff. The opposite was the case for those from secondary schools; staff who did not know how they were paid; and staff who said they did not know what type of contract they had.

Regression analysis of change over time revealed that, when compared to their counterparts in Wave 1:

- Overall staff mentioned significantly fewer benefits of training, but there was no significant change in levels of satisfaction with training and development.
- Staff from schools in the middle quintile of achievement mentioned significantly more benefits of training. The opposite was true for support staff with a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2⁵⁰.
- Staff from secondary schools and staff aged 25-34 reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction with their training and development.

7.1 Quality and relevance of training and development

7.1.1 The quality of training and development

Support staff who had received training in the last 12 months were asked to rate the quality of their most recent training and development (see also Section 6) and the results from this question are shown in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 Quality of training and development

Response:	%
Very good	58
Fairly good	38
Fairly poor	3
Very poor	1
Don't know	1
N=2346	

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

⁵⁰ Level 2 qualifications in mathematics are equivalent to GCSE grade A*-C, consisting of O-level (pass), CSE (grade 1), GCSE (grade A*-C), Adult Basic Skills in Numeracy Level 2, Key Skills in Application of Number Level 2, Scottish Standard Grade, NVQ Level 2, AO Level and City and Guilds Level 2.

Almost all staff said that the quality of their most recent training had been ‘very’ or ‘fairly good’ (96 per cent); about three fifths of all those questioned (58 per cent) said that the quality was ‘very good’. A very small proportion of staff reported that the quality of their training and development had been ‘fairly’ or ‘very poor’ (four per cent).

7.1.2 The relevance of training and development

Staff were also asked to rate how effectively their most recent training and development had met their needs for their specific role. Table 7.2 presents the findings.

Table 7.2 Training and meeting the needs of support staff

Response:	%
Very good	56
Fairly good	38
Fairly poor	4
Very poor	1
Don’t know	1
N=2346	

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

As with ‘quality’, almost all staff said that their most recent training had been ‘very’ or ‘fairly good’ (94 per cent) at meeting needs related to staff’s specific roles; about half (56 per cent) said it was ‘very good’. A very small proportion of staff reported that their training and development had been ‘fairly’ or ‘very poor’ (five per cent) at meeting role-related needs.

7.2 Benefits of training and development

Staff who had received training in the last 12 months were asked, in their own words, to provide information about what they thought the benefits of their training had been. Table 7.3 below presents the responses given by two per cent or more of staff.

Table 7.3 Benefits of training and development received in the last 12 months

The benefits of training and development	%
Helped with specific role	53
Improved outcomes for the children/young people and staff	15
Helped staff gain confidence	9
Helped develop awareness, knowledge and skills	8
Helped self-development	7
Had no benefits	6
Enabled staff to take on greater responsibilities	3
Helped with career progression/promotion	3
Improved job satisfaction	2
Improved relationships with teachers	2
Too early to say	2
Did not know benefits	3
N=2343	

Multiple response item

More than one answer could be put forward, so percentages do not sum to 100

About half of those responding to this question (53 per cent) said that a benefit of their most recent training had been in ‘helping them carry out their specific role’, however compared to Wave 1 this response had dropped by 15 percentage points. Much smaller proportions of staff mentioned a range of other benefits, including that their most recent training had ‘improved outcomes for pupils and staff’, helped ‘develop confidence’, helped ‘develop awareness, knowledge and skills’ and that it had contributed to their ‘self-development’ (in the range 15 to seven per cent).

The 343 staff who had mentioned more than one benefit relating to their most recent training and development were asked to identify what they thought was the main benefit, and Table 7.4 below presents the responses. Results largely reflected the pattern of responses presented in Table 7.3, although proportions for each response were lower. About a third of staff (30 per cent) reported that the main benefit of training and development had been that it ‘helped with their specific role’, about a fifth (21 per cent) that it had ‘improved outcomes for the children/young people they work with’ and about a tenth (12 per cent) reported the main benefit had been that it had increased their ‘confidence’. Six

per cent did not know or were not able to say what the main benefit of their most recent training had been.

Table 7.4 The main benefit of training and development

Main benefits of training and development	%
Helped with specific role	30
Improved outcomes for the children/young people and staff	21
Helped staff gain confidence	12
Helped develop awareness, knowledge and skills	7
Did not know main benefit	6
Helped self-development	5
Enabled staff to take on greater responsibilities	3
Enabled staff to take on/do a different role	3
Helped with career progression/promotion	3
Improved relationships with teachers	3
Improved job satisfaction	2
N=343	

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer and missing responses, percentages may not sum to 100

7.3 Satisfaction with training and development: Wave 2 regression analysis

Further analysis⁵¹ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- perceived multiple benefits of training/development (Appendix C3, Table C3.21)
- perceived relevance of training and satisfaction with training/development (Appendix C3, Table C3.21).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of staff and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.1, Table C2.1 and C3).

⁵¹ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

7.3.1 Perceived multiple benefits of training

A higher number of perceived benefits

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to perceive a significantly higher number of benefits from their most recent training and development:

- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff from schools in the middle quintile of achievement.

A lower number of perceived benefits

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to perceive a significantly lower number of benefits from their most recent training and development:

- staff from the largest schools
- specialist and technical staff
- staff who were paid during term-time only and who have contracted hours during term-time only.

7.3.2 Satisfaction with and relevance of training in the past 12 months

Higher levels of satisfaction

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to express significantly higher levels of satisfaction with their most recent training and development and its perceived relevance:

- teaching assistants, learning support staff, administrative staff and pupil support staff
- staff employed on a full-time basis
- staff from special schools
- support staff with a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2
- staff who held, were registered for, or were working towards a higher number of vocational qualifications
- staff who had been at their school for three to four years.

Lower levels of satisfaction

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to express significantly lower levels of satisfaction with their most recent training and development and its perceived relevance:

- those from secondary schools
- staff who do not know how they were paid
- staff who said they did not know what type of contract they had
- staff who had academic qualifications at, equivalent to, or better than level 3
- staff from schools in a metropolitan authority
- staff aged 25-34.

7.4 Satisfaction with training and development: change over time analysis

Further analysis⁵² examined change over time, between Wave 1 and Wave 2, in relation to two factors:

- perceived multiple benefits of training/development (Appendix C4, Table C4.14)
- perceived relevance of training and satisfaction with training/development (Appendix C4, Table C4.15).

A regression analysis was then conducted to identify the patterns of responses related specific groups of staff (for further explanation see Appendix C1.2, C2, Table C2.2 and C4).

7.4.1 Perceived multiple benefits of training

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, staff mentioned significantly fewer benefits of training
- staff from schools in the middle quintile of achievement mentioned significantly more benefits of training

⁵² The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

- support staff with a qualification in mathematics at, equivalent to, or better than level 2 mentioned significantly fewer benefits of training.

7.4.2 Satisfaction with and relevance of training in the past 12 months

When the responses from Wave 2 were compared to Wave 1, analysis found that compared to their Wave 1 counterparts:

- overall, there was no significant change in levels of satisfaction with training and development
- staff from the following groups reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction with their training and development:
 - staff from secondary schools
 - staff aged 25-34.

8. Support staff with more than one role

This section presents key findings and then in detail reports the results of analyses relating to support staff holding more than one role in school. When participating in the telephone survey, staff who had more than one role were mainly asked about their experiences in a single role selected by the researcher (see Appendix E1.3.2)⁵³. Their perceptions of differences in training and development between this and their other role(s) were addressed in Section F of the survey, and those findings are presented here (see Appendix B1).

Key findings about staff with more than one role

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Staff with more than one role were fairly evenly split between those who felt that there was a fairly high degree of difference in the training and development they had received in their different roles; about two fifths (42 per cent) said that there had been a difference of ‘a great deal’ or ‘to some extent’, whereas about a third (36 per cent) reported ‘not very much’ or ‘no difference at all’.
- The most frequent response as to how training differed related to the ‘development of different skills’ for additional role(s). This was reported by about two fifths (43 per cent) who also emphasised how different their various roles were, hence the need for very different skills and therefore training.
- The proportions responding that the content of their training had helped develop new skills rose by 13 percentage points in comparison to Wave 1.

Regression analysis⁵⁴ revealed that support staff with more than one role:

- were less likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2

⁵³ The main role that staff were asked questions in relation to was selected and determined to reflect the sample category targets in each of the main six categories and according to school stratification criteria.

⁵⁴ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. A full explanation of this analysis is provided in Appendix C.

- were registered for, or were working towards a significantly higher number of vocational qualifications
- were significantly more likely to have had the involvement of line managers in decisions about their training and development needs
- were significantly more positive about their experience of line management and performance review processes
- felt significantly better supported, by their school, in terms of meeting their training and development needs
- placed significantly greater importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training
- experienced significantly more types of activity associated with induction.

8.1 Differences in training and development between roles for support staff with more than one role

After providing a series of responses relating to one of their roles (as selected by an automated matrix), staff who were identified as having multiple roles by the research team (based on information gathered from schools) were asked to indicate whether their experience of training and development differed between their different roles. A total of 455 staff were selected and have been included in the following analyses, however by the time of the survey 75 (16 per cent) of these staff said they did not have an additional role⁵⁵.

8.1.1 The extent to which training differed between roles for support staff with more than one role

Staff were asked the extent to which their training and development differed between their roles. Their answers to this question can be seen in Table 8.1 below.

⁵⁵ It may be the case that in the time between collecting staff information from schools and conducting the survey, staff roles changed, hence this group of staff who said that they did not have another role.

Table 8.1 Extent to which training and development differs between roles

Response:	%
A great deal	21
To some extent	21
Not very much	22
Not at all	14
Had not received training or development for other role/s	3
Difference depends on the training/which role/could not generalise	1
Don't know	1
Did not have more than one role	16
N=455	

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

As Table 8.1 shows, about two fifths (42 per cent) of support staff with more than one role said that there had been ‘a great deal’ or ‘some extent’ of difference, whereas about a third (36 per cent) reported ‘not very much’ or ‘no difference at all’. A small proportion of staff (three per cent) said that they had not had any training or development for any additional role.

8.1.2 How training differed between roles for support staff with more than one role

The 192 support staff who gave a response indicating a degree of difference between their roles in terms of training and development (a great deal/to some extent), were asked to describe this difference in their own words. Responses were collated and the themes to emerge most frequently are summarised in Table 8.2.

Responses show that by far the most frequent response as to how training differed related to the development of ‘different skills’ for additional roles. This was reported by about two fifths (43 per cent) who also emphasised how different their various roles were and hence the need for very different skills and therefore training. The proportions responding that the content of their training had helped develop new skills rose by 13 percentage points in comparison to Wave 1. There were a range of other responses, which have been listed in the table. However, given the very low number of staff providing information, caution should be used in interpreting these data.

Table 8.2 The ways in which training differed for staff with more than one role

The ways in which training for additional role/s differed:	%
Content of training related to additional role/s:	
Training developed different skills (for a completely different role)	43
Training was more specific/less generic	2
Training was more thorough/learnt more	3
Training was more practical/hands-on rather than theoretical	3
Availability and uptake of training:	
Had not received any training for additional role/s	2
Had received training for additional roles (but not for previously discussed role)	5
More training was available for additional role/s	5
Less training was available for additional role/s	3
Had received more training for additional role/s	5
Had received less training for additional role/s	5
Less training was needed for additional role/s	3
Location of training:	
Training for additional role/s was external/off site	3
Other	7
Did not know how training differed	4
N=192	

Open response question

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

8.2 Support staff with more than one role: Wave 2 regression analysis

Previously reported regression analysis⁵⁶ revealed that support staff with more than one role:

- were less likely to hold a qualification in English at, equivalent to, or better than level 2

⁵⁶ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. A full explanation of this analysis is provided in Appendix C.

- were registered for, or were working towards a significantly higher number of vocational qualifications
- were significantly more likely to have had the involvement of line managers in decisions about their training and development needs
- were significantly more positive about their experience of line management and performance review processes
- felt significantly better supported, by their school, in terms of meeting their training and development needs
- placed significantly greater importance on personal development as a reason to undertake training
- experienced significantly more types of activity associated with induction.

9. The leaders survey: introduction and sample profile

9.1 Introduction

At the same time as wave 2 of the support staff telephone survey was being conducted, in November of 2008, a survey of school leaders⁵⁷ was completed. The leaders survey was designed to explore views about:

- the deployment of support staff and future plans in this regard
- the professional development requirements of support staff
- the training opportunities for support staff
- any barriers to providing support staff with training and development.

9.1.1 The administration of the leaders survey

Before a final version of the questionnaire was sent to schools, an initial draft was piloted with 20 schools and, as a result, minor amendments were made.

Headteachers in 2,281 schools, some of which had agreed to provide support staff information for wave 2 of the support staff telephone survey, were asked to complete (or to pass on to the most suitable colleague) a questionnaire exploring the issues outlined above (see Appendix B2). The intention was to secure responses from those most likely to be involved strategically in the deployment and training and development of support staff.

While headteachers were sent a hard copy of the questionnaire, they were also provided with the opportunity of completing the questionnaire online if they so wished. Table 9.1 presents response data for this exercise. As can be seen, response rates as a proportion of schools originally drawn were comparatively low, and during recruitment a top up sample of schools was added from NFER's Register of Schools (ROS) so that response targets could be met.

⁵⁷ Headteachers in schools were asked to complete or, pass on for completion to the most suitable senior colleague, a questionnaire (see Appendix B2). The instructions to the headteacher explained that the selected 'respondent' should be a senior member of staff with a strategic view of support staff training and development in their school.

Questionnaires were returned by 621 schools and nine schools returned two questionnaires, hence in total 630 responses were received. The number of respondents completing the leaders survey online suggests that many still prefer hard copy completion, at least when provided with hard copy and online as an option.

Table 9.1 Leaders survey recruitment and responses

School type	N=		
	schools drawn	schools responding	questionnaire responses provided online
Primary	1266	324	92
Secondary	592	165	33
Special	423	132	22
N=	2281	621	147

As can be seen in Appendix A (see Tables A5, A6 and A7), the responses received were representative of the national picture in relation to secondary and special schools and differ only very slightly on two factors relating to primary schools, hence the findings reported here are generalisable to England as a whole.

9.1.2 The presentation of analysis

The responses from the leaders survey are presented in the remainder of Section 9 and in the subsequent four sections (10 to 13) and five appendices (A to E)⁵⁸.

Sections 10 to 13 are divided into two parts; the first presents overall descriptive analysis and the second regression analysis⁵⁹. With the exception of this section, all key findings are summarised at the beginning of each of the following sections. The remainder of this section presents findings about the profile of leaders survey respondents. Subsequent sections present responses about:

⁵⁸ Further information about the analysis of the leaders survey can be found in Appendix E2.

⁵⁹ For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first. The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C1.3 for further information.

- the deployment of support staff and future plans in this regard (Section 10)
- the professional development requirements of support staff (Section 11)
- the training opportunities for support staff (Section 12)
- any barriers to providing support staff with training and development (Section 13).

9.2 Key findings

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- The majority of leaders were female (70 per cent).
- Almost two thirds of leaders (65 per cent) were distributed across the mid age range bands (35-54); about a quarter of leaders (28 per cent) were aged 55 or more.
- A small proportion were from minority ethnic groups (two per cent).
- About three quarters (76 per cent) of leaders were either headteachers (43 per cent) or deputy headteachers (33 per cent), while about a tenth were identified as SBMs (9 per cent)
- Headteachers in primary schools were more likely to have the overall responsibility for the training and development of support staff than was the case for special and secondary schools
- Deputy headteachers in secondary and special schools are more likely to have the overall responsibility for the training and development of support staff than was the case for primary schools.
- The length of time leaders had spent in their current role was distributed across a broad time range, with half of the leaders reporting that they had been working in their current role for 5 years or more.
- Most leaders (94 per cent) reported working full-time.
- A small number of leaders (four per cent) reported that they met the Disability Discrimination Act definition of disability.

9.3 The overall profile of leaders

9.3.1 Number of leaders surveyed

Table 9.2 below shows the achieved sample profile by gender, age and ethnic background⁶⁰.

Table 9.2 Achieved sample by gender, age and ethnicity

	Gender:		Age:				Ethnicity:		Disability:	
	Male	female	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	white	minority ethnic group	yes	no
N=	143	443	26	128	285	178	602	14	26	582
%	23	70	4	20	45	28	96	2	4	92
% missing ⁶¹	7		2				2		2	

N=630

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Table 9.2 shows that more than two thirds of leaders (70 per cent) were female and that the sample included leaders from across the age ranges. About two thirds of leaders (65 per cent) were distributed across the mid age range bands (35-54). Of the remainder, about a quarter (28 per cent) were in the upper age range bracket (55+) and four per cent were in the lowest age band (18-34), leaving two per cent of leaders who did not provide information about their age.

Most leaders described themselves as ‘white’. The ‘white’ category includes all leaders who identified themselves as being of white ethnic background, including White European and White South African. Those categorised as belonging to a minority ethnic group were staff who identified themselves as being from any ethnic group other than that classified as white⁶². In all cases, leaders identified their own ethnicity.

⁶⁰ Full ethnicity information was collected (see Appendix A, Table A4). However, for the purpose of analysis, due to the small numbers of staff from minority ethnic groups, these groups had to be collapsed into ‘minority ethnic staff’. This group does not include anyone identifying themselves as white.

⁶¹ This includes those respondents who preferred not to say and those who gave no response.

⁶² See Appendix A, Table A8 for a full breakdown.

Analysis of national school census data available in SFR 28/2008 (DfES, 2008) revealed that in 2008, 94.3 per cent of teachers in the LA maintained sector belonged to the ‘white’ group, while 4.7 per cent belonged to a minority ethnic group. This suggests that leaders from minority ethnic groups were slightly underrepresented when compared to teaching staff nationally.

Leaders were also asked if they met the Disability Discrimination Act definition of disability; most (92 per cent) said they did not, while 4 per cent said they did⁶³.

9.3.2 Job titles and gender of leaders

Leaders were asked about their role; responses are presented in Table 9.3 below.

Table 9.3 Job titles of leaders and school type

Job title	% overall response	School sector %		
		Primary	Secondary	Special
Headteacher ⁶⁴	43	64	16	28
Deputy headteacher or equivalent ⁶⁵	33	19	41	59
School Business Managers (SBMs) ⁶⁶	9	3	27	<1
Other role ⁶⁷	14	14	14	12

N=630

Responses exclude missing responses, which was one per cent

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Responses show that:

- overall, about three quarters (76 per cent) of leaders were either headteachers (43 per cent) or deputy headteachers (33 per cent), while about a tenth were identified as School Business Managers (SBMs) (9 per cent)
- about two thirds of leaders from primary schools were headteachers (64 per cent), compared to smaller proportions of headteachers in secondary and special schools (16 and 28 per cent respectively)

⁶³ See Appendix A, Table A8 for a full breakdown.

⁶⁴ This includes principals and executive headteachers.

⁶⁵ This includes assistant headteachers.

⁶⁶ This includes school business managers, bursars, senior finance officers and directors of finance.

⁶⁷ This category includes small numbers of a diverse range of role types including SENCO, senior teacher, inclusion manager, CPD manager, TA manager, administrator and HLTA.

- about three fifths (59 per cent) of leaders from special schools were deputy headteachers, compared to about two fifths (41 per cent) of leaders from secondary schools and about a fifth (19 per cent) from primary schools
- more than a quarter of leaders (27 per cent) from secondary schools were categorised as SBMs, compared to much smaller proportions from primary and special schools (three and less than one per cent respectively).

Of these leaders:

- headteachers in primary schools were more likely to have the overall responsibility for the training and development of support staff in their schools than was the case for special and secondary schools
- deputy headteachers in secondary and special schools are more likely to have the overall responsibility for the training and development of support staff in their schools than was the case for special and primary schools.

Additional analysis revealed that, of the 13 per cent of leaders who identified themselves as having a job title other than headteacher, deputy headteacher or SBM, about a tenth (11 per cent⁶⁸) reported their main job title as ‘CPD manager/coordinator’ or ‘director of training’⁶⁹.

It should be noted that while it was intended for the survey to be completed by members of the senior leadership team with overall responsibility for the training, development and deployment of support staff, it is recognised that this does not preclude the likely involvement of other members of staff in matters of support staff training and deployment⁷⁰.

Analysis was also conducted to explore how gender related to respondent role, and overall there were much larger proportions of females in all job title categories⁷¹, with about three quarters of leaders for each of the three named categories being female (in the range 70 to 76 per cent) compared to about a quarter in each case who were male (in the range 24 to 29 per cent).

⁶⁸ Nine respondents.

⁶⁹ For further discussion see Section 14.1, which brings together findings from the leaders survey with those from the staff survey.

⁷⁰ In fact, recent TDA research supports this observation, confirming that other members of staff are involved in support staff CPD. See http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/r/research_into_cpd_leadership_in_schools.pdf, page 20.

⁷¹ Not counting those who had not indicated their job title.

9.3.3 Length of time working in current role

Leaders were asked to state how long they had worked in schools, and Table 9.4 below presents the findings for this question.

The analysis revealed that the length of time leaders had spent in their current role was distributed across a broad range of years. Half of the leaders (50 per cent) reported that they had been working in schools for 5 years or more. The highest frequency of response, mentioned by a third of leaders, was five to nine years. This was followed by about a fifth of leaders (29 per cent) who said they had been in their current role for two years or less.

Table 9.4 Length of time working in current role

Response:	%
Less than one year	6
1-2 years	23
3-4 years	19
5-10 years	33
More than 10 years	17

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

N missing responses=two per cent

Leaders were also asked whether they worked on a part-time or full-time basis; almost all (94 per cent) reported that they were working full-time, while five per cent reported that they worked on a part-time basis.

10. Deployment of support staff and future planning

This section presents the key findings and then in detail explores responses from Section B of the leaders survey (see Appendix B2). The questions in this section explored the factors that inform the deployment of support staff and leaders' views on the future contributions of support staff in helping to meet school priorities. Specifically, leaders were asked about the:

- factors that contribute to decisions about the deployment of support staff
- confidence of senior leadership that the school would be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of support staff to meet their school priorities
- importance of the contribution of different types of support staff over the next three years to meeting school priorities
- degree of growth expected in the hours worked by support staff over the next three years.

Key findings about the deployment of support staff and future planning

Descriptive analysis showed that:

- Overall, the two most frequently mentioned and highest ranked priorities in determining the roles and responsibilities of support staff were 'to meet the needs of individual pupils', and 'to improve the skills and knowledge of individual support staff'.
- The factor mentioned least and ranked lowest generally was 'to address staff shortages in certain areas', with about half leaders (54 per cent) ranking this factor in last place.
- Broadly, leaders reported that their school's senior leadership were confident ('very' or 'quite') that the different support staff roles could be adapted to meet their school's priorities (from three quarters to nearly all responding in this way).
- Broadly, support staff with a more direct role with pupils were mentioned more frequently as having an increasingly important role to play in relation to six identified policy issues. Teaching assistants were mentioned in relation to all six policy issues, but particularly in relation to the pupil-

centred issues like ‘supporting pupil attainment’ (55 per cent) and ‘improving the outcomes for children and young people’ (54 per cent).

- Responses also show that pupil support staff were expected to play an increasingly important role in ‘empowering young people and families’ (31 per cent) and ‘liaising with parents/carers and families’ (30 per cent).
- More than half of leaders (in the range 55 to 77 per cent) reported that they anticipated growth (‘substantial’, ‘some’ or ‘a little’) in the numbers of hours worked by staff in all six support staff categories. A higher proportion of leaders said that they expected to see substantial growth in the number of hours worked by support staff involved in teaching and pupil support, and a lower proportion anticipated growth in the hours of technical and site staff.

Regression analysis of responses revealed that compared to their counterparts, the following leaders⁷²:

- Placed significantly more importance on strategic factors in determining the roles of support staff: leaders from larger schools; and those from schools in the second lowest quintile of achievement. The opposite was the case for those in unitary authorities.
- Were significantly more confident that their senior leadership would be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of support staff to meet school priorities: those in schools with higher proportions of pupils with SEN; leaders in schools in the middle and highest quintiles of achievement; and those from larger schools. The opposite was the case for those from special schools; male senior leaders; and those from schools in London boroughs.
- Anticipated a significantly higher degree of growth in the hours worked by support staff over the next three years: those from secondary schools; leaders from minority ethnic groups; and those from rural schools. The opposite was the case for those aged 55-64; leaders in schools offering more extended services; and those from schools in the West Midlands GOR.

Regression analysis also revealed leaders:

- Anticipated a significantly higher degree of growth in the hours worked by pupil support staff, learning support staff, and teaching assistants.
- Were significantly more confident that their senior leadership would be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of administrative staff, teaching assistants, and learning support staff.

⁷² The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C1.3 for further information.

10.1 Factors determining roles and responsibilities of support staff

Leaders were asked to rank, from one to six, a series of pre-defined factors in order of the importance they had in determining the roles and responsibilities of the support staff in their school. To do this, leaders were asked to put a number from one to six against each factor, with 1 signifying the most important factor and 6 the least important. The findings are presented in Table 10.1 below.

Table 10.1 The importance of different factors in determining roles and responsibilities of support staff

Response:	% ranked:					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
To meet the needs of individual pupils	47	27	15	6	2	1
To improve the skills and knowledge of individual support staff	32	28	20	11	5	2
To meet the priorities identified in the school's improvement plan	23	28	23	16	6	3
To meet the school's National Agreement obligations	5	8	14	17	31	24
To enable professional development of support staff	4	8	17	33	28	8
To address staff shortages in certain areas	2	5	8	10	18	54

N=630

One respondent provided an invalid response

Single response item

Due to rounding and missing responses percentages may not sum to 100

Analysis showed that:

- overall, the three most frequently mentioned and highest ranked priorities were 'to meet the needs of individual pupils', 'to improve the skills and knowledge of individual support staff', and 'to meet the priorities identified in the school's improvement plan'
- overall, the least mentioned and broadly lowest ranked priorities were 'to meet the school's National Agreement obligations', 'to enable professional development of support staff', and 'to address staff shortages in certain areas'.
- in relation to ranking 1, the most frequently mentioned factor by leaders in determining the roles and responsibilities of the support staff in their school was 'meeting the needs of individual pupils', mentioned by about

half (47 per cent). This was followed by the skills and knowledge of individual support staff, and the need to meet the priorities identified in the school's improvement plan, mentioned by about a third and a fifth of leaders respectively (32 per cent and 23 per cent).

- the factor mentioned least and ranked lowest generally was 'to address staff shortages in certain areas', with about half leaders (54 per cent) ranking this factor in sixth (and last) place.

10.2 Confidence in school leadership

For each of the six main support staff categories, leaders were asked to rate how confident they were that their school would be able to adapt their roles and responsibilities to meet their school's priorities. The findings are presented in Table 10.2 below.

Table 10.2 Confidence in senior leadership being able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of support staff to meet school priorities

Support staff category	% responding:					% missing
	very confident	quite confident	not very confident	not at all confident	don't know	
Teaching assistants or equivalent	52	45	2	<1	<1	1
Administrative staff	60	35	3	<1	<1	<1
Learning support staff	48	44	1	-	1	6
Pupil support staff	47	42	2	-	2	7
Site staff	38	45	9	2	4	2
Specialist and technical staff	32	44	5	1	8	10

N=630

Single response item

Due to rounding and missing responses percentages may not sum to 100

Broadly, leaders reported that their school's senior leadership were confident ('very' or 'quite') that all support staff roles could be adapted to meet their school's priorities (from three quarters to nearly all responding in this way). This was particularly the case in relation to teaching assistants, administrative staff, and learning support staff, with about nine in ten leaders (in the range 92 to 97 per cent per cent) reporting 'confidence' in this regard. This was also

true for a slightly smaller proportion of leaders (89 per cent) in relation to pupil support staff.

A noticeable proportion of leaders (76 per cent) reported that their senior leadership were ‘very’ or ‘quite’ confident about their school’s ability to adapt the roles and responsibilities of specialist and technical staff to meet their school’s priorities.

In relation to site staff and specialist and technical staff, very similar proportions (15 and 14 per cent respectively) of leaders reported that their schools’ senior leadership were either not ‘confident’ or were ‘not sure’ about their schools’ ability to adapt the roles and responsibilities of these staff to meet school priorities.

10.3 The importance of support staff roles in meeting policy needs

With regard to each of the six main categories of support staff, leaders were asked to indicate which would have an increasingly important role to play in regard to a pre-determined list of key developments over the next three years. The findings are presented in Table 10.3 below.

Table 10.3 Importance of support staff roles over the next three years

Key policy issues	% mentioning the following staff:						% missing
	Site staff	Administrative staff	Technical	Specialist and	Teaching assistants	Pupil Support	
Improving the outcomes	<1	1	3	54	9	25	8
Pupil attainment	<1	2	6	55	7	23	7
Delivering personalisation	<1	1	6	39	23	24	7
Empowering young people/families	<1	4	8	29	31	20	8
Parents/carers/families liaison	1	21	6	19	30	15	8
Multi-agency/practitioners liaison	<1	23	11	13	28	16	8

N=630

Single response item

Due to rounding and missing responses percentages may not sum to 100

Staff in a role with more direct contact with pupils were mentioned more frequently as having an increasingly important role to play in relation to all six policy issues. Teaching assistants were mentioned in relation to all six policy issues, but particularly in relation to pupil-centred issues like ‘supporting pupil attainment’ (55 per cent), ‘improving the outcomes for children and young people’ (54 per cent), delivering ‘personalised services to young people’ (39 per cent) and to ‘empowering young people and families’ (29 per cent).

The next most frequently reported group was learning support staff, with a fifth to a quarter of leaders (in the range 20 to 25 per cent) saying these staff would have an increasingly important role to play in relation to bringing about four of the six developments (and more than one in ten mentioning the remaining two factors in relation to this group). Responses show that pupil support staff were also expected to play an increasingly important role in ‘empowering young people and families’ (31 per cent), ‘liaising with parents/carers and families’ (30 per cent) and ‘liaising with other children’s services, agencies and practitioners’ (28 per cent).

About a fifth of leaders identified administrative staff as having an increasingly important role to play in regard to ‘liaison with other agencies/practitioners’ and ‘parents/carers/families’ (23 and 21 per cent), while much smaller proportions of leaders said the same about the contribution of specialist and technical staff (11 and six per cent).

Broadly, responses indicate that few leaders envisaged site staff as having an important role to play in relation to any of the issues presented. This is perhaps not surprising, given that they generally have no direct input into teaching and learning practice and pupil well-being.

10.4 The hours worked by support staff

Leaders were asked what degree of growth they anticipated in the number of hours worked by support staff over the next three years in order to meet their schools’ priorities, for each of the six main support staff categories. The findings are presented below in Table 10.4.

Table 10.4 Degree of growth expected in hours worked by support staff over the next three years

Support staff category	% responding:					% missing
	substantial growth	Some growth	little growth	no growth	don't know	
Teaching assistants or equivalent	9	42	26	20	1	2
Administrative staff	7	42	26	22	2	1
Learning support staff	9	37	26	16	4	8
Pupil support staff	10	37	23	17	5	9
Specialist and technical staff	5	35	27	20	7	7
Site staff	3	19	33	36	5	5

N=630

Single response item

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding and missing responses

More than half of leaders (in the range 55 to 77 per cent) reported that they anticipated ‘substantial’, ‘some’ or ‘a little’ growth in the numbers of hours worked by staff in all six support staff categories (over the next three years), in order to meet their school’s priorities.

Broadly Table 10.4 shows that:

- higher proportions of leaders said that they expected to see growth in the number of hours worked by support staff involved in teaching and pupil support, and lower proportions anticipated growth in the hours of technical and site staff
- about three quarters of leaders expected ‘substantial’, ‘some’ or ‘a little’ growth in the hours of teaching assistants, administrative staff and learning support staff (77, 75 and 72 per cent respectively) in order to meet school priorities, while about a fifth did not (in the range 16 to 22 per cent)
- about two thirds said that they expected ‘substantial’, ‘some’ or ‘a little’ growth in the hours of pupil support and specialist and technical staff (70 and 67 per cent respectively) in order to meet school priorities, while about a fifth did not (in the range 17 to 20 per cent)
- about a half of leaders said that they expected ‘substantial’, ‘some’ or ‘a little’ growth in the hours of site staff (55 per cent) in order to meet school priorities, while about a third did not (36 per cent).

The findings broadly match leaders' views of the different types of support staff that are expected to play an increasingly important role in delivering key developments in schools over the next three years (see Table 10.3 above). However, while administrative staff generally featured less frequently in the responses presented in Table 10.3, leaders expected substantial growth comparatively in their hours to meet school priorities. Administrative staff were the second most frequently mentioned staff category in this regard.

10.5 Deployment of support staff and future planning: regression analysis

Further analysis⁷³ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- strategic factors determining roles and responsibilities of support staff (see Appendix C5, Table C5.1)
- confidence in adapting the roles and responsibilities of support staff (see Appendix C5, Table C5.2)
- the degree of growth expected in hours worked by support staff (see Appendix C5, Table C5.3).

A regression analysis was then conducted to identify the patterns of responses related to specific groups of staff (for further explanation see Appendix C1.3, C2 Tables C2.3 and C5).

10.5.1 Factors determining roles and responsibilities of support staff

More importance placed on strategic factors

Compared to their counterparts, leaders from larger schools and from schools in the second lowest quintile of achievement placed significantly more importance on strategic factors in determining the roles of support staff.

⁷³ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

Less importance placed on strategic factors

Compared to their counterparts, leaders in unitary authorities placed significantly less importance on strategic factors in determining the roles of support staff.

10.5.2 Confidence in adapting the roles and responsibilities of support staff**More confidence in being able to adapt roles and responsibilities**

Leaders reported being significantly more confident that their senior leadership would be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of administrative staff, teaching assistants, learning support staff and pupil support staff to meet the school's priorities.

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported being significantly more confident that their senior leadership would be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of support staff to meet school priorities, leaders:

- in schools with higher proportions of pupils eligible for SEN
- in schools in the middle and highest quintiles of achievement
- from larger schools
- who had been in their current role longer
- who had a registered disability
- from schools in the North East GOR.

Less confidence in being able to adapt roles and responsibilities

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported being significantly less confident that their senior leadership would be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of support staff to meet school priorities:

- leaders from special schools
- male leaders
- leaders from schools in London boroughs
- leaders from schools in the Yorkshire and Humber GOR.

10.5.3 Degree of growth anticipated in the number of hours worked by support staff over the next three years**A higher degree of growth in the hours worked**

Leaders reported anticipating a significantly higher degree of growth in the hours worked by pupil support staff, learning support staff, teaching assistants,

administrative staff and specialist and technical staff over the next three years, than was the case for site staff.

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to anticipate a significantly higher degree of growth in the hours worked by support staff over the next three years, leaders:

- from secondary schools
- from minority ethnic groups
- from rural schools
- from special schools
- in schools with a higher proportions of pupils with EAL
- in schools in the highest quintile of achievement.

A lower degree of growth in the hours worked

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups were found to anticipate a significantly lower degree of growth in the hours worked by support staff over the next three years, leaders:

- aged 55-64
- in schools offering more extended services
- from schools in the West Midlands GOR.

11. The professional development of support staff

This section presents key findings then goes on to explore in detail responses to Section C of the leaders survey (see Appendix B2). The questions in this section explored the extent to which leaders thought they were meeting the professional development needs of their support staff, and their views on the importance of different types of training for different support staff roles. Specifically, leaders were asked:

- how confident they were that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of support staff
- the extent to which they had been able to access training and development provision to meet the identified needs of support staff
- given the school's priorities over the next three years, what they thought the single most important area for professional development for support staff was
- what they thought were the most effective professional development activities for support staff.

Key findings about the professional development of support staff

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Most leaders (69 to about 94 per cent) were 'very' or 'quite' confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of each of the six main support staff categories.
- About a tenth of leaders reported, however, that they were 'not confident' about their school's ability to identify the professional development needs of site staff (11 per cent) and specialist and technical staff (10 per cent).
- Most leaders (in the range 64 to 93 percent) reported that they had 'to a large extent' or 'to some extent' been able to access training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of each of the six staff categories.
- Nearly all leaders said that they had 'to a large extent' or 'to some extent' been able to access training and development provision over the last 12

months to meet the identified needs of administrative staff and teaching assistants (93 and 92 per cent).

- Smaller proportions reported that over the last 12 months they had ‘rarely’ or ‘not’ accessed training and development to meet the identified needs of site staff and specialist and technical staff (19 and 11 per cent).
- The area for professional development identified as most important was by far ‘role specific expertise or knowledge’, and the least mentioned were ‘EAL’ and ‘mathematics and numeracy skills’.
- Types of training most frequently selected as being the most effective for a range of development needs were ‘externally provided’ and ‘in-house’ training. The least frequently mentioned forms were ‘foundation degrees’, ‘self-directed learning’ and ‘school induction training’.

Regression analysis of responses revealed that, compared to their counterparts, the following reported⁷⁴:

- Being significantly more confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of support staff: leaders from schools in the North West GOR; and those from schools offering more extended services. The opposite was true for male leaders; those from secondary schools; and SBMs.
- They had accessed significantly more training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of support staff: those from rural schools; those from special schools; and leaders who had been in their current role for longer. The opposite was the case for male leaders; and those in schools in the second lowest quintile and second highest quintiles of achievement.
- Placing more importance on core curriculum subjects for support staff: leaders from schools with higher proportions of pupils eligible for FSM. The opposite was the case for those from rural schools.
- Placing less importance on other subjects for support staff: those aged 55-64; and those in schools with higher percentages of pupils eligible for FSM.
- Placing more importance on SEN and welfare for support staff: leaders from schools in the North West GOR.

⁷⁴ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

Regression analysis also revealed leaders:

- Were significantly more confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of teaching assistants, learning support staff, and administrative staff.
- Had accessed significantly more training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of teaching assistants, learning support staff, and administrative staff.

11.1 Identifying the needs of support staff

Leaders were asked how confident they were that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of each of the six main support staff categories. The findings are presented in Table 11.1 below⁷⁵.

Table 11.1 Confidence in identifying professional development needs of support staff

Support staff category:	% responding:						% missing
	very confident	quite confident	not very confident	not at all confident	don't know	not applicable	
Teaching assistants or equivalent	51	43	3	-	<1	1	2
Administrative staff	45	49	5	<1	<1	<1	1
Learning support staff	40	43	3	<1	<1	5	8
Site staff	27	52	10	1	2	4	3
Pupil support staff	36	42	4	1	<1	9	9
Specialist and technical staff	25	44	9	1	1	13	8

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Broadly, between two thirds to about ninety percent of leaders reported that they were 'very' or 'quite' confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of each of the six main support staff categories. Nearly all leaders reported such confidence in relation to teaching

⁷⁵ For further discussion see Section 14.2, which brings together findings from the leaders survey with those from the staff survey.

assistants and administrative staff (94 and 93 per cent respectively), while about four fifths of leaders were also ‘very’ or ‘quite’ confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of learning support and site staff (83 and 79 per cent respectively). Slightly smaller portions of leaders were similarly confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of pupil support staff and specialist and technical staff (77 and 69 per cent respectively).

However, small but noticeable proportions (about a tenth in each case) of leaders reported that they were ‘not confident’ about their school’s ability to identify the professional development needs of site staff (11 per cent) and specialist and technical staff (10 per cent). Further, similar proportions of leaders, about one in ten, responded ‘not applicable’ regarding their confidence in their school’s ability to identify the training needs of specialist and technical staff (13 per cent) and pupil support staff (nine per cent).

11.2 Access to training and development provision

Leaders were asked to what extent they had been able to access training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of each of the six main support staff categories. Table 11.2 presents the findings.

Broadly, most leaders (in the range 64 to 93 percent) reported that they had ‘to a large extent’ or ‘to some extent’ been able to access training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of each of the six main support staff categories.

Nearly all leaders reported that they had ‘to a large extent’ or ‘to some extent’ been able to access training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of administrative staff and teaching assistants (93 and 92 per cent). Most said the same about learning and pupil support staff (80 and 74 per cent) and about two thirds reported that the needs of site staff and specialist and technical staff had been similarly met (69 and 64 per cent). However, smaller but noticeable proportions of leaders reported that over the last 12 months they had ‘rarely’ or ‘not’ accessed training and development provision to meet the identified needs of site staff and specialist and technical staff (19 and 11 per cent).

Table 11.2 Extent to which respondents have accessed training and development provision over the last 12 months

Support staff category:	% responding:						% missing
	large extent	some extent	rarely	not at all	don't know	not applicable	
Administrative staff	40	52	4	<1	1	<1	2
Teaching assistants or equivalent	50	42	2	<1	<1	2	3
Learning support staff	39	42	4	<1	<1	7	9
Pupil support staff	33	41	4	1	<1	10	11
Site staff	21	48	15	4	3	6	3
Specialist and technical staff	16	48	10	1	2	15	9

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Additional analysis explored the reasons why some leaders had not accessed training and development provision over the last 12 months. Of those 195 leaders who selected 'rarely' or 'not at all' for any of the six support staff roles:

- About a third (31 per cent) reported there was a perceived lack of relevant courses or appropriate training for one or more support staff roles, but particularly for cleaning staff and caretakers.
- About a tenth (13 per cent) explained that, since some staff were not on the school payroll, the responsibility for their training and development was perceived to be rest outside of the school, particularly in relation to site staff and specialist and technical staff.
- About a tenth (11 per cent) were not sure what the professional development needs of support staff were, or had deemed that no training was required.
- A tenth (10 per cent) reported that constraints on the financial resources available for staff training had limited the amount of training undertaken by support staff.

11.3 Areas for professional development

For each of the six main categories of support staff, leaders were asked to indicate the single most important area for professional development when considering their school's priorities over the next three years. The findings are presented in Table 11.3⁷⁶.

Table 11.3 Most important areas for professional development for the six main support staff categories

Areas for professional development	Support staff category:					
	site staff	active staff	technical administrative	specialist and	teaching assistants	pupil support
Role-specific expertise or knowledge	46	44	29	10	7	8
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	<1	<1	2	11	9	16
ICT skills	1	10	15	3	1	3
Safeguarding children/promoting welfare	5	3	2	5	12	5
General curriculum knowledge	0	1	3	13	2	7
Integrated/multi-agency working	1	7	3	2	7	4
Basic skills (e.g. first aid, handling/lifting)	15	3	1	1	2	1
Behaviour management	<1	<1	1	7	8	6
Working with parents and carers	1	5	1	3	7	4
English literacy/skills	0	<1	<1	6	3	4
Subject knowledge	<1	1	4	4	1	2
English as an additional language (EAL)	<1	<1	1	1	2	2
Mathematics/numeracy skills	0	0	<1	2	1	2
More than one response given	3	8	7	26	14	15
Missing	27	17	31	7	24	22

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

In Table 11.3, the key areas for professional development have been listed from top to bottom to indicate the cumulative frequency of response that each professional development area attracted, in terms of leaders reporting that it was the single most important development area for each group of staff. Taking responses relating to each support staff category together in relation to

⁷⁶ For further discussion see Section 14.5, which brings together findings from the leaders survey with those from the staff survey.

the single most important area for development, the most frequently mentioned was by far ‘role specific expertise or knowledge’ and the least mentioned were ‘EAL’ and ‘mathematics and numeracy skills’.

Further, analysis revealed that the most frequently mentioned responses for professional development were:

- for site staff ‘role-specific expertise or knowledge’, mentioned by 46 per cent of leaders, and then ‘basic skills’, mentioned by 15 per cent
- for administrative staff ‘role-specific expertise or knowledge’, mentioned by 44 per cent, and then ICT skills, mentioned by 10 per cent
- for specialist and technical staff ‘role-specific expertise or knowledge’, mentioned by 29 per cent, and then ‘ICT skills’, mentioned by 15 per cent
- for teaching assistants, similar proportions mentioned the three areas ‘general curriculum knowledge’ (13 per cent), SEN (11 per cent) and ‘role-specific expertise or knowledge’ (10 per cent)
- for pupil support staff similar proportions mentioned the following ‘safeguarding’ (12 per cent), SEN (nine per cent) and ‘behaviour management’ (eight per cent)
- for learning support staff SEN, mentioned by 16 per cent, and then ‘role-specific expertise or knowledge’ (eight per cent).

Broadly, the four subject-related areas were mentioned least frequently by leaders as being the single more important area for development in relation to all staff categories, with the exception of ‘English literacy skills’, which was identified by six per cent of leaders as being the single most important area of development for teaching assistants.

11.4 Effective professional development activities

Using the same list of pre-defined areas for professional development outlined in Table 11.3 above, leaders were asked to indicate which method of training they thought was the most effective. The findings are presented below in Table 11.4

Table 11.4 lists from left to right the most frequently selected types of professional development as being most ‘effective’, namely ‘externally provided training’ to the least frequently mentioned in the last column, ‘foundation degrees’. By far the most frequently selected as being the most

effective types of training were ‘externally provided’ and ‘in-house’ training. The least frequently mentioned, along with ‘foundation degrees’, were ‘self-directed learning’ and ‘school induction training’.

Table 11.4 Most effective professional development activities for support staff

Areas for professional development	% responding:								% missing
	training externally provided	in-house training	other on-the- job activities	accredited qualification	other equivalent NVQs or	induction training	school learning	self directed	foundation degrees
Role-specific expertise or knowledge	23	23	15	5	15	6	2	2	8
General curriculum knowledge	15	49	13	3	3	5	4	3	6
English literacy/skills	28	31	6	10	11	2	5	2	6
Mathematics/numeracy skills	27	31	6	10	11	2	5	2	6
ICT skills	24	41	6	9	7	2	4	1	6
Safeguarding children/promoting welfare	47	31	2	4	2	9	<1	<1	6
Behaviour management	29	51	5	2	1	6	<1	<1	5
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	36	39	4	6	3	4	1	1	6
Basic skills (e.g. first aid, handling and lifting)	68	9	1	13	2	2	<1	0	5
Subject knowledge	15	40	12	6	5	1	10	4	7
Integrated/multi-agency working	42	26	16	2	1	3	2	<1	7
English as an additional language (EAL)	54	15	3	7	2	2	4	<1	13
Working with parents and carers	20	41	18	2	1	10	1	<1	6

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Further, in terms of the most frequently provided responses, analysis of Table 11.4 reveals that ‘externally provided training’ was thought the most effective way to address a range of training areas, most notably ‘basic skills’, ‘EAL’ and ‘safeguarding’, mentioned respectively by 68, 54 and 47 per cent of leaders.

Data presented in Table 11.4 also showed that:

- ‘In-house training’ was also thought the most effective way to address a wide range of training areas, most notably ‘behaviour management’ and ‘general curriculum knowledge’, mentioned respectively by about half of leaders (51 and 49 per cent).
- ‘Other on-the-job training’ was mentioned as the most effective way to address a wide range of training areas, most notably about one fifth (18 per cent) to one tenth (12 per cent) of leaders mentioned ‘working with parents’, ‘integrated multi-agency working’, ‘role-specific knowledge’, ‘general curriculum knowledge’ and ‘subject knowledge’.
- ‘Other accredited qualifications’ were reported by about a tenth of leaders as the most effective way to address ‘basic skills’ (13 per cent), and ‘English literacy skills’ and ‘mathematics skills’ (both 10 per cent).
- ‘NVQs or their equivalent’ were mentioned as the most effective way to address ‘role-specific knowledge’ (15 per cent), and ‘English literacy skills’ and ‘mathematics skills’ (both 11 per cent).
- ‘School induction training’ was reported by about a tenth of leaders as the most effective way to address ‘working with parents’ (10 per cent).
- ‘Self directed learning’ was reported by about a tenth of leaders as the most effective way to address ‘subject knowledge’ (10 per cent).
- ‘Foundation degrees’ were identified as being the most effective way to address a range of training areas, but in each case the response frequency was very small.

It should be noted that while these findings give some indication of leaders’ preferences for different training routes, the findings may also reflect a number of other factors, such as:

- the availability of such activities
- leaders’ level of familiarity with the different training packages available
- considerations of time
- the willingness and/or capacity of staff to take up training.

11.5 Professional development of support staff: regression analysis

Further analysis⁷⁷ revealed sets of correlated items which related to:

- confidence in identifying professional development needs of support staff (see Appendix C5, Table C5.4)
- extent to which leaders have accessed training and development provision to meet identified needs of support staff (see Appendix C5, Table C5.5)
- most important areas for professional development (see Appendix C5, Table C5.6 to C5.8).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of respondent and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.3, Table C2.3 and C5).

11.5.1 Confidence in identifying professional development needs of staff

More confidence in identifying the professional development needs of staff

Leaders reported being more confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of teaching assistants, learning support staff, administrative staff, and pupil support staff than was the case for site staff.

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported being more confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of support staff, leaders from schools:

- in the North West GOR
- offering more extended services.

⁷⁷ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

Less confidence in identifying the professional development needs of staff

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported being less confident that their school had been able to identify the professional development needs of support staff:

- male leaders
- leaders from secondary schools who were SBMs
- leaders in schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL.

11.5.2 Extent to which leaders have accessed training and development provision

More access to training and development provision

Leaders reported they had accessed significantly more training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of teaching assistants, learning support staff, administrative staff, pupil support staff and specialist and technical staff than was the case for site staff.

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported they had accessed significantly more training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of support staff, leaders:

- from rural schools
- from special schools
- who had been in their current role for a longer period.

Less access to training and development provision

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported they had accessed significantly less training and development provision over the last 12 months to meet the identified needs of support staff:

- male leaders
- leaders in schools in the second lowest and second highest quintiles of achievement
- leaders from schools in the West Midlands GOR
- leaders who were SBMs
- leaders in London boroughs in schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL

11.5.3 Most important areas for professional development⁷⁸

More importance placed on core curriculum subjects

Leaders from schools with higher proportions of pupils eligible for FSM reported placing more importance on core curriculum subjects for support staff than did their counterparts.

Less importance placed on core curriculum subjects

Compared to their counterparts, leaders from rural schools reported placing less importance on core curriculum subjects for support staff.

Less importance placed on other subjects

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups reported placing less importance on other subjects for support staff, leaders:

- aged 55-64
- in schools with higher percentages of pupils eligible for FSM.

More importance placed on SEN and welfare

Compared to their counterparts, leaders from schools in the North West GOR reported placing more importance on SEN and welfare for support staff.

⁷⁸ Please note, some caution should be taken when interpreting these figures due to the small number of respondents who gave a valid response to question eight of the leaders survey.

12. Training opportunities for support staff

This section presents the key findings and then explores in detail responses from Section D of the leaders survey (see Appendix B2). The questions in this section explored:

- the importance of different factors in informing the selection of external training providers
- leaders' top four considerations when selecting an external provider of training.

Key findings about training opportunities for support staff

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- Nearly all those responding said that 'evidence of positive impact' and the training being 'practical as opposed to theoretical' were 'always' or 'sometimes' important when selecting a training provider (95 per cent in both cases).
- The most frequently mentioned factors of any ranking when selecting an external training provider were 'evidence of the positive impact of training' (82 per cent), and the 'cost of training' and 'links training has to professional and/or occupational standards' (both 68 per cent).

Regression analysis of responses revealed, that compared to their counterparts, the following placed⁷⁹:

- More importance on professional standards when selecting an external provider of training and development: leaders in schools in the middle quintile of achievement; deputy headteachers; and leaders from schools in the North West GOR.
- Less importance on the applicability and relevance when selecting an external provider of training and development: deputy headteachers; SBMs; and leaders in roles other than headteacher.

⁷⁹ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

- Less importance on financial resources when selecting an external provider of training and development: leaders from schools with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for FSM; leaders from schools in the highest quintile of achievement; and leaders from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL.
- More importance on the location of training and the type of provider when selecting an external provider of training and development: leaders in schools in the second lowest and second highest quintiles of achievement; and leaders aged 55-64. The opposite was the case for leaders from larger schools; leaders from schools with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for FSM; and leaders from schools in the highest quintile of achievement.

12.1 The selection of external training providers

Leaders were asked to what extent a series of pre-defined factors were important in enabling the selection of an external provider of training and development. The findings are presented in Table 12.1 below⁸⁰.

Table 12.1 Factors informing the selection of external training providers

Factors related to selecting a training provider	% responding:					% missing
	always important	sometimes important	not often important	not important	not applicable	
Evidence of positive impact of training in own or other schools	65	30	3	<1	<1	2
The training is practical as opposed to theoretical	45	50	2	<1	<1	2
Links to professional/occupational standards	47	43	7	1	<1	2
The cost of training	44	45	8	1	<1	2
The appropriateness of mode of training (online, face-to-face)	48	40	8	1	<1	2
An accessible location	42	44	11	1	<1	2
External funding available	25	53	16	3	<1	2
The training is organised by the LA	15	53	23	7	<1	2

N=630, Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

⁸⁰ For further discussion see Section 14.3, which brings together findings from the leaders survey with those from the staff survey.

Overall, most leaders reported that all of the factors were ‘always’ or ‘sometimes important’ in enabling the selection of an external provider of training and development (in the range 95 to 68 percent). Nearly all those responding said that ‘evidence of positive impact’ and the training being ‘practical as opposed to theoretical’ were ‘always’ or ‘sometimes’ important when selecting a training provider (95 per cent in both cases).

Most leaders reported thought that links to ‘professional/occupational standards’, the ‘cost of training’, the ‘appropriateness of the mode of training’ and an ‘accessible location’ were ‘always’ or ‘sometimes’ important when selecting a training provider (in the range 90 to 85 per cent). About a tenth of leaders said that these factors were either ‘not often’ or ‘not’ important (in the range eight to 12 per cent).

About four fifths of leaders (79 per cent) mentioned that the ‘availability of external funding’ and about two thirds (68 per cent) that ‘the training was organised by a local authority’ as being ‘always’ or ‘sometimes’ important when selecting a training provider. About a fifth to a third of leaders said that these factors were either ‘not often’ or ‘not’ important (19 and 30 per cent respectively).

Leaders were also given the opportunity to say if they thought that any of the factors were ‘not applicable’ for consideration, less than one per cent said this was the case in relation to each of the factors provided.

12.2 The most important considerations when selecting an external training provider

Using the same factors listed in Table 12.1, leaders were asked to select four and rank them from 1 to 4, indicating the importance they placed in each when selecting an external provider of training and development. Leaders were asked to put a number against each of the factors, with 1 signifying the most important factor and 4 the least important one, and 569 leaders provided a valid response to this question.

12.2.1 Factors most and least frequently ranked anywhere 1 to 4

Analysis revealed that the most frequently mentioned factors of any ranking when selecting an external training provider mentioned by leaders were:

- ‘evidence of the positive impact of training’ (82 per cent).
- ‘cost of training’ and ‘links training has to professional and/or occupational standards’ (both 68 per cent).
- training that ‘is practical as opposed to theoretical’ (66 per cent).
- training that is deemed to be at an ‘accessible location’ (39 per cent).

Additional analysis revealed that from the list of pre-defined factors, less frequently mentioned important considerations when selecting a provider of external training were whether the training was ‘organised by the LA’ (106 leaders) and whether ‘external funding was available’ to support the training (119 leaders).

12.2.2 Factors most frequently ranked 1, 2, 3 or 4

Analysis also revealed that the following were most and least frequently ranked as important in determining the selection of an external training provider.

Factors most frequently ranked 1

About a third of those providing a valid response (36 per cent) ranked ‘Evidence of positive impact’ as the most important factor. The three other responses most frequently ranked as 1 were: ‘a link to professional/occupational standards’ (25 per cent), ‘practical training’ (20 per cent), and ‘cost of training’ (nine per cent).

Factors most frequently ranked 2

About a fifth of those providing a valid response (22 per cent) ranked ‘Evidence of positive impact’ as the second most important factor. The three other responses most frequently ranked as 2 were: ‘practical training’ (21 per cent), ‘cost of training’ (19 per cent), and ‘a link to professional/occupational standards’ (18 per cent).

Factors most frequently ranked 3

About a fifth of those providing a valid response (19 per cent) ranked ‘Cost of training’ as the third most important factor. The three other responses most frequently ranked as 3 were: ‘evidence of positive impact’ (17 per cent),

‘appropriateness of mode of training’ (16 per cent), and ‘practical training’ and ‘a link to professional/occupational standards’ (both 14 per cent).

Factors most frequently ranked 4

About a fifth of those providing a valid response (22 per cent) ranked ‘Cost of training’ as the fourth most important factor. The three other responses most frequently ranked as 4 were: ‘a link to professional/occupational standards’ (12 per cent), ‘appropriateness of mode of training’ (12 per cent), and ‘practical training’ (10 per cent).

12.3 The importance of factors informing the selection of external training providers: regression analysis

Further analysis⁸¹ revealed sets of correlated items which related to factors informing the selection of external training providers in relation to the importance placed on:

- professional standards (see Appendix C5, Table C5.9)
- the applicability and relevance of training (see Appendix C5, Table C5.10)
- financial resources (see Appendix C5, Table C5.11)
- location for provider of training (see Appendix C5, Table C5.12).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of respondent and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.3, Table C2.3 and C5).

12.3.1 Professional standards

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed more importance on professional standards when selecting an external provider of training and development, leaders:

- in schools in the middle quintile of achievement
- who were deputy headteachers
- from schools in the North West GOR.

⁸¹ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

12.3.2 Applicability and relevance

Compared to their counterparts, leaders who were deputy headteachers, SBMs, staff in roles other than headteacher, and those from schools in the West Midlands GOR placed less importance on applicability and relevance when selecting an external provider of training and development.

12.3.3 Financial resources

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed less importance on financial resources when selecting an external provider of training and development, leaders from schools:

- with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for FSM
- in the highest quintile of achievement
- with a higher percentage of pupils with EAL.

12.3.4 The location and type of provider

More importance placed on location and provider

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed more importance on the location of training and the type of provider, when selecting an external provider of training and development, leaders:

- in schools in the second lowest and second highest quintiles of achievement
- aged 55-64.

Less importance placed on location and provider

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups placed less importance on the location of training and the type of provider, when selecting an external provider of training and development, leaders:

- from larger schools
- from schools with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for FSM
- from schools in the highest quintile of achievement
- from schools in the East Midlands GOR
- from schools with a higher percentage of pupils with SEN
- who were male
- who belonged to a minority ethnic group.

13. Barriers to professional development

This section first presents key findings and then goes on to explore in detail responses from Section E of the leaders survey (see Appendix B2). The questions in this section explored the frequency with which leaders found funding, releasing staff or the timing of training to be barriers to training support staff⁸².

Key findings and barriers to professional development

Descriptive analysis revealed that:

- About three fifths of leaders said that ‘locating alternative funding’ (63 per cent) and ‘local authority funding not providing for staff cover’ (59 per cent) were ‘frequently’ funding-related barriers to providing support staff training and development.
- Analysis revealed that overall releasing staff for training appeared to have been a more frequently experienced challenge than funding issues had.
- About three quarters of leaders (73 per cent) reported training that ‘usually took place within support staff contracted hours’ was ‘frequently’ a barrier, while about a quarter of leaders (25 per cent) said this was not frequently a barrier.

Regression analysis of responses revealed that compared to their counterparts, the following⁸³:

- Identified significantly fewer barriers to support staff training related to local funding issues: leaders from special schools; leaders from schools in the Yorkshire and Humber GOR; and leaders in schools offering more extended services.
- Identified a significantly greater number of barriers to support staff training related to funding access issues: schools in the second highest

⁸² For further discussion see Section 14.6, which brings together findings from the leaders survey with those from the staff survey.

⁸³ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

achievement and second lowest quintile. The opposite was the case for leaders in secondary schools.

- Identified a significantly larger number of barriers related to issues associated with the release of support staff: leaders in schools in the second highest quintile of achievement.
- Identified a significantly greater number of barriers to support staff training related to the timing of training: leaders in schools with a higher percentage of pupils eligible for FSM; and leaders in schools in the highest quintile of achievement. The opposite was the case for leaders in roles other than a headteacher.
- Identified a significantly greater number of barriers to support staff training related to time issues: leaders in London boroughs and unitary authorities. The opposite was the case for deputy headteachers.

13.1 Funding support staff training and development

Leaders were asked how frequently they found a series of pre-defined funding issues to be a barrier to support staff training and the findings are presented in Table 13.1 below.

About three fifths of leaders said that locating alternative funding (63 per cent) and 'local authority funding not providing for staff cover' (59 per cent) were 'frequently' funding barriers to providing support staff training and development. About two fifths of leaders said the same about their local authorities 'not funding support staff training' (41 per cent), their school was not able to 'pay for staff to train outside of their contracted hours' (39 per cent), and funding applications being 'too complex' (38 per cent). About one third of leaders (35 per cent) reported that their school had 'no specific funding for training' as a barrier to providing training and development to support staff.

Conversely, about half reported that the following funding issues were 'not frequently' a barrier to support staff training: their school had 'no specific funding for training' (53 per cent), their school was not able to 'pay for staff to train outside of their contracted hours' (52 per cent), and that their local authority 'did not fund support staff training' (47 per cent).

Table 13.1 Funding and support staff training and development

Funding issues	% responding:					% missing
	very frequently	quite frequently	not very frequently	hardly ever	not applicable	
Locating alternative funding sources is difficult	31	32	13	9	12	3
Local authority funding pays for training but not for staff cover	28	31	18	15	7	1
The local authority does not fund training for support staff	13	28	30	18	10	1
The school cannot pay staff for training outside of their contracted hours	17	22	24	28	9	<1
Funding applications are complex and time-consuming	13	25	25	19	16	2
School has no specific funding for support staff	12	23	28	25	12	1

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

Conversely, about half reported that the following funding issues were ‘not frequently’ a barrier to support staff training: their school had ‘no specific funding for training’ (53 per cent), their school was not able to ‘pay for staff to train outside of their contracted hours’ (52 per cent), and that their local authority ‘did not fund support staff training’ (47 per cent).

13.2 Releasing staff for training and development

Leaders were asked how frequently they found a series of pre-defined issues related to releasing staff for training to be a barrier to professional

development (see Appendix B2). The findings are presented in Table 13.2 below.

Analysis revealed that, when compared to responses on funding in Table 13.1, overall releasing staff for training appeared to have been a more frequently experienced challenge than funding issues had, with more than half of the leaders reporting that four of the five staffing issue options were ‘frequently’ a barrier to support staff training (in the range 57 to 74 per cent).

Table 13.2 Releasing staff for training and development

Staffing issues	% responding:					% missing
	very frequently	quite frequently	not very frequently	hardly ever	not applicable	
Releasing support staff when several need the same training	39	35	16	8	2	1
Cover is not available for support staff undertaking training	41	28	15	13	3	1
Cover for support staff is difficult to organise	33	35	18	10	4	<1
Cover for support staff undertaking training has a disruptive impact on pupils/the school	23	34	26	13	3	1
My school cannot fund cover for support staff while they undertake training	24	24	23	20	9	1

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

About three quarters of leaders (74 per cent) said that ‘releasing support staff when several needed the same training’ was frequently a problem, this was the most frequently mentioned response on staffing. About two thirds of leaders said that frequently ‘cover was not available for support staff undertaking training’ (69 per cent) and that cover was ‘difficult to organise’ (67 per cent), while 57 per cent said that ‘the disruption organising cover had on pupils and

the school’ was frequently a barrier to support staff training. About half of leaders said that their school could not ‘fund cover for support staff while they undertake training’ (48 per cent).

The following staffing issues were reported as ‘not frequently’ presenting a barrier to support staff training:

- ‘schools not being able to fund cover for support staff while they undertook training’ and providing cover for support staff undertaking training ‘had a disruptive impact on pupils/the school’ (42 and 39 per cent)
- ‘cover for support staff was difficult to organise’, ‘cover was not available for support staff undertaking training’ and the difficulties of ‘releasing support staff when several needed the same training’ (28, 27 and 24 per cent).

13.3 The timing of support staff training and development

Leaders were asked how frequently they found a series of pre-defined issues related to the timing of training to be a barrier to professional development (see Appendix B2). The findings are presented in Table 13.3.

Analysis revealed that:

- about three quarters of leaders (73 per cent) reported training that ‘usually took place within support staff’s contracted hours’ was ‘frequently’ a barrier, while about a quarter of leaders (25 per cent) said this was not frequently a barrier
- about two thirds (65 per cent) said finding ‘sufficient time for training within part-time support staff’s hours’ was ‘frequently’ a barrier, while a third of leaders (30 per cent) said this was not frequently a barrier
- about half (48 per cent) reported that the ‘time taken for appropriate training’ was ‘frequently’ a barrier, while a similar proportion of leaders (49 per cent) said this was not frequently a barrier
- about two fifths of leaders (41 per cent) reported that the ‘training that took place outside of support staff’s contracted hours’ was ‘frequently’ a barrier, while 58 per cent said this was not frequently a barrier.

Table 13.3 The timing of support staff training and development

Timing issues	% responding:					% missing
	very frequently	quite frequently	not very frequently	hardly ever	not applicable	
Training usually takes place within support staff's contracted hours	33	40	17	7	1	1
Finding sufficient time for training within part-time support staff's hours	21	44	21	9	4	<1
The total amount of time the appropriate training activity takes	10	38	36	13	2	1
Training usually takes place outside support staff's contracted hours	12	29	41	16	<1	1

N=630

Single response item

Due to percentages being rounded to the nearest integer, they may not sum to 100

13.4 Barriers to professional development: regression analysis

Further analysis⁸⁴ revealed sets of correlated items which related to barriers to support staff training and development:

- funding, including local issues and access to funding (see Appendix C5, Tables C5.13 and C5.14)
- releasing staff (see Appendix C5, Table c5.15)

⁸⁴ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. See Appendix C for full explanations of each factor. For the regression analyses, only variables that have a statistically significant relationship with the outcome (at the 5 per cent level) are reported. The variables are reported in order, with those showing the strongest relationship reported first.

- the timing of training, including training hours in relation to contracted hours and the availability of time (see Appendix C5, Tables C5.16 and C5.17).

Regression analysis then identified which groups of respondent and school-level characteristics correlated to responses to each of these items (for further explanation of this analysis see Appendix C1.3, Table C2.3 and C5).

13.4.1 Funding and support staff training

A smaller number of local funding issues

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups identified significantly fewer barriers to support staff training related to local funding issues, leaders:

- from special schools
- from schools in the Yorkshire and Humber GOR
- in schools offering more extended services.

A larger number of funding access issues

Compared to their counterparts, leaders in schools in the second highest and second lowest achievement quintiles identified a significantly greater number of barriers to support staff training related to funding access issues.

A smaller number of funding access issues

Compared to their counterparts, leaders in secondary schools identified significantly fewer barriers related to funding access for support staff training.

13.4.2 Releasing staff for training

A larger number of barriers relating to releasing staff

Compared to their counterparts, leaders in schools in the second highest quintile of achievement identified a significantly larger number of barriers related to issues associated with the release of support staff.

13.4.3 The timing of training

A larger number of barriers relating contracted hours

Compared to their counterparts, the following groups identified a significantly greater number of barriers to support staff training related to the timing of training, leaders in schools with a high percentage of pupils eligible for FSM, and leaders in schools in the highest quintile of achievement.

A smaller number of barriers relating to contracted hours

Compared to their counterparts, staff in roles other than headteacher identified significantly fewer barriers to support staff training related to the timing of training in relation to contracted hours.

A larger number of barriers relating to the availability of time

Compared to their counterparts, leaders in London boroughs and unitary authorities identified a significantly greater number of barriers to support staff training related to the availability of time.

A smaller number of barriers relating to the availability of time

Compared to their counterparts, deputy headteachers identified significantly fewer barriers to support staff training related to the availability of time.

14. Viewing the staff and leaders surveys together

The nature of this study allows for the opportunity to look across two waves of support staff surveys, and reflect their views against those of senior managers. This is important: in relation to science teaching staff, a 2006 study found a major disconnect between what senior leaders in schools felt their staff were experiencing in terms of CPD related to their subject, and the views of their staff (Wellcome Trust, 2006).

14.1 Line management

Analysis revealed that over time support staff were reporting a reduction in the number of people involved in their training, while the leaders survey suggested a higher percentage of senior teaching staff being responsible for support staff development. Taken together, these findings might suggest a rationalisation of line management for support staff, within which the importance of support staff training and development has increased.

14.2 Identifying and meeting needs

The findings of this study are largely encouraging:, both leaders and their staff are generally positive about the experience of identifying needs. However, specialist and technical staff thought they were less likely to have their training needs met, as did support staff from secondary schools. Responses from the leaders survey clearly mirror this challenge with respondents reporting less confidence in meeting the needs of these same staff.

14.3 The reasons for selecting training

There was less congruence between views when considering the reasons for selecting training and development options. Support staff tended to see training in relation to their own role, while school leaders were more inclined to see training and development in terms of how it related to strategic considerations, such as school-wide priorities.

14.4 Accessing training

Generally, both groups felt able to access appropriate training of sufficient quality. Support staff from rural schools and special schools were less likely to say they had not had any training in the last twelve months; responses to the leaders survey were congruent, with respondents from the same types of school reporting accessing more training for their staff.

14.5 The type of training

The training experiences of staff varied according to the category of support staff they belonged to; for instance those with more pupil centred roles tended to undertake more child-focused training. Child-focused training was increasingly featured, as was that focusing on integrated working. Again, the congruence between the responses of site and technical staff and of leaders was striking; schools were struggling to address and meet the needs of these groups, and more generally where demand related less to pupil-orientated support.

14.6 Barriers

The majority of support staff identified some barriers to training with funding and staff cover being less reported constraints. Broadly, this perspective on funding was confirmed by the leaders' survey respondents, but the same cannot be said of leaders' principal concerns, which actually centred around release of staff and timing of training.

14.7 Considering both surveys together

It would appear that the majority of schools now have a good, clear, structure for managing support staff development, and that this view is shared by support staff. Whether this has been a direct effect of whole-school workforce planning taking root or a corollary of a greater focus on performance management for teaching staff since September 2007 is not yet clear.

15. References

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., and Webster, R. (2008) *The Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools and the Impact of the National Agreement (Strand 2, Wave 1, 2005/06)*. Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Research Brief 027 [online]. Available: <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RB027%20v2.pdf> [19 March 2009]

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., and Webster, R. (2007) *The Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools: Report on findings from the second national questionnaire survey of schools, support staff and teachers (Strand 1, Wave 2, 2006)*. Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Research Report 005 [online]. Available: <http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RB005.pdf> [19 March 2009]

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A. and Webster, R. (2007). *Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools* (DCSF Research Report 005). London: DCSF [online]. Available: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/DCSF-RR005.pdf> [5 September, 2007]

Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., Russell, A., Webster, R. and Haywood, N. (2006a). *The Deployment and Impact of Support Staff in Schools* (DfES Research Report 776) [online]. Available: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR776.pdf> [16 April, 2007]

Blatchford, P., Russell, A., Bassett, P., Brown, P. and Martin, C. (2006b). *The Role and Effects of Teaching Assistants in English Primary Schools (Years 4 to 6) 2000 - 2003: Results from the Class Size and Pupil-Adult Ratios (CSPAR) KS2 Project* (DfES Research Report 605) [online]. Available: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR605.pdf> [19 April, 2007].

Department for Children, Schools and Families. (2008a). *The Children's Plan. Building Brighter Futures Cm 728*. The Stationery Office. London.

Department for Children, Schools and Families. (2008b). *Being the Best for Our Children. Releasing Talent for Teaching and Learning* [online].

Available: <http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/default.aspx?PageFunction=productdetails&PageMode=publications&ProductId=DCSF-00246-2008&> [17 March, 2009]

Department for Education and Skills (2005). *Leading and Coordinating CPD in Secondary Schools: School CPD Leaders and School Strategy Managers*. London: DfES [online].

Available:

http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/secondary/keystage3/all/respub/ws_cpdlac_p [19 March, 2009]

England and Wales. Statutes (2004). *Children Act 2004. Chapter 31*. London: The Stationery Office [online].

Available: http://www.opsi.gov.uk/Acts/acts2004/ukpga_20040031_en_1 [8 December, 2008].

HM Government (2004). *Every Child Matters: Change for Children*. London: DfES [online].

Available:

http://www.everychildmatters.gov.uk/_files/F9E3F941DC8D4580539EE4C743E9371D.pdf [8 December, 2008].

Robinson, M., Walker, M., Kinder, K. and Haines, B. (2008). Research into the role of CPD leadership in schools. Slough: NFER. [online].

Available: [http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-](http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-data/summaries/research-into-the-role-of-continuing-professional-development-leadership-in-schools.cfm)

[data/summaries/research-into-the-role-of-continuing-professional-development-leadership-in-schools.cfm](http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-data/summaries/research-into-the-role-of-continuing-professional-development-leadership-in-schools.cfm) [19 March, 2009]

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2009a). *Our Role* [online].

Available: <http://www.tda.gov.uk/about/role.aspx> [7 May, 2009].

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2009b) *Continuing Professional Development Leadership* [online].

Available:

<http://www.tda.gov.uk/teachers/continuingprofessionaldevelopment/cpdleadership.aspx> [7 May, 2009].

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2009c) *Continuing Professional Development*.

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2007). *Supporting the Leadership of Continuing Professional Development in Schools* [online].

Available:

http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/cpd/supporting_leadership_cpd.pdf [19 March 2009]

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2006). *Developing People to Support Learning: a Skills Strategy for the Wider School Workforce 2006-09* [online].

Available: http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/pdf/s/swdb_3ys.pdf [27 April, 2006].

Training and Development Agency for Schools (2005). *Building the School Team: Our Plans for Support Staff Development 2005-06* [online]. Available: [http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/doc/f/faqs-\(plan-for-website\)-\(word\).doc](http://www.tda.gov.uk/upload/resources/doc/f/faqs-(plan-for-website)-(word).doc) [19 April, 2007].

Wilson, R., Sharp, C., Shuayb, M., Kendall, L., Wade, P. and Easton, C. (2007). Research into the deployment and impact of support staff who have achieved HLTA status. Slough: NFER. [online]. Available: <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/research-areas/pims-data/summaries/hlta-status.cfm> [19 March, 2009].

Wright, N. and Colquhoun, D. (2007). *Bursar Development Programme. Final Evaluation Report 2003–2007*. Nottingham: NCSL [online]. Available: <http://www.ncsl.org.uk/programmes-index/sbm-index/sbm-publications.htm> [7 May, 2009].

Appendix A. Sample representativeness and ethnicity

Table A1 Telephone survey, primary schools sample representativeness

		Sample		National	
		Count	%	Count	%
Government Office Region	North East	28	6.06	909	5.29
	North West/Merseyside	50	10.82	2529	14.71
	Yorkshire & The Humber	44	9.52	1854	10.79
	East Midlands	46	9.96	1678	9.76
	West Midlands	41	8.87	1816	10.57
	Eastern	64	13.85	2032	11.82
	London	36	7.79	1811	10.54
	South East	93	20.13	2646	15.39
	South West	60	12.99	1913	11.13
	N	462	100.00	17188	100.00*
School type	Infant/First	94	20.35	2777	16.16
	Primary/Combined	322	69.70	12847	74.74
	Junior	43	9.31	1464	8.52
	Middle	3	0.65	100	0.58
	N	462	100.00	17188	100.00
% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	95	20.56	3625	21.09
	2nd lowest 20%	105	22.73	3407	19.82
	Middle 20%	102	22.08	3346	19.47
	2nd highest 20%	86	18.61	3290	19.14
	Highest 20%	73	15.80	3221	18.74
	Missing	1	0.22	299	1.74
	N	462	100.0	17188	100.00*
Achievement Band (KS1 Overall performance 2002)	Lowest band	88	19.05	2960	17.22
	2nd lowest band	89	19.26	3106	18.07
	Middle band	81	17.53	3210	18.68
	2nd highest band	92	19.91	3241	18.86
	Highest band	91	19.70	3579	20.82
	Missing	21	4.55	1092	6.35
	N	462	100.00	17188	100.00
Size of school	Smallest 3rd	176	38.10	5710	33.22
	Middle 3rd	156	33.77	5664	32.95
	Largest 3rd	130	28.14	5696	33.14
	Missing			118	0.69
	N	462	100.00	17188	100.00*
% of pupils with statements (2005)	None	114	24.68	3546	20.63
	1-2%	229	49.57	9447	54.96
	3-29%	118	25.54	3896	22.67
	Missing	1	0.22	299	1.74
	N	462	100.00	17188	100.00*
Single sex/Coeducational schools	Boys			3	0.02
	Girls			4	0.02
	Mixed	462	100.00	17142	99.73
	Missing			39	0.23
Total	N	462	100.00	17188	100.00

Keys: *: significant at the 5% level

Table A2 Telephone survey, secondary schools sample representativeness

		Sample		National	
		Count	%	Count	%
Government Office Region	North East	12	8.11	200	6.18
	North West/Merseyside	25	16.89	445	13.75
	Yorkshire & The Humber	15	10.14	308	9.51
	East Midlands	14	9.46	295	9.11
	West Midlands	16	10.81	388	11.99
	Eastern	16	10.81	412	12.73
	London	13	8.78	383	11.83
	South East	22	14.86	492	15.20
	Missing	15	10.14	314	9.70
	N	148	100.00	3237	100.00
School type	Middle	14	9.46	236	7.29
	Comprehensive to 16	50	33.78	1191	36.79
	Comprehensive to 18	73	49.32	1496	46.22
	Other Secondary schools	2	1.35	151	4.66
	Grammar	9	6.08	163	5.04
	N	148	100.00	3237	100.00
% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	22	14.86	479	14.80
	2nd lowest 20%	38	25.68	832	25.70
	Middle 20%	43	29.05	851	26.29
	2nd highest 20%	33	22.30	664	20.51
	Highest 20%	12	8.11	411	12.70
	N	148	100.00	3237	100.00
Achievement Band (total GCSE point score 2005)	Lowest band	22	14.86	620	19.15
	2nd lowest band	38	25.68	638	19.71
	Middle band	25	16.89	630	19.46
	2nd highest band	21	14.19	604	18.66
	Highest band	28	18.92	517	15.97
	Missing	14	9.46	228	7.04
	N	148	100.00	3237	100.00
Size of school	Smallest 3rd	48	32.43	1080	33.36
	Middle 3rd	56	37.84	1080	33.36
	Largest 3rd	44	29.73	1077	33.27
	N	148	100.00	3237	100.00
% of pupils with statements (2005)	None	14	9.46	241	7.45
	1-2%	64	43.24	1663	51.37
	3-29%	70	47.30	1332	41.15
	Missing			1	0.03
		148	100.00	3237	100.00
Single sex/Coeducational schools	Boys	7	4.73	175	5.41
	Girls	15	10.14	220	6.80
	Mixed	126	85.14	2842	87.80
Total	N	148	100.00	3237	100.00

N.B. Two schools in the sample are excluded as they could not be matched to the population

Table A3 Telephone survey, special schools sample representativeness

		Sample		National	
		Count	%	Count	%
Government Office Region	North East	8	8.08	62	6.19
	North West/Merseyside	13	13.13	164	16.37
	Yorkshire & The Humber	8	8.08	87	8.68
	East Midlands	8	8.08	81	8.08
	West Midlands	10	10.10	123	12.28
	Eastern	14	14.14	95	9.48
	London	14	14.14	142	14.17
	South East	20	20.20	162	16.17
	South West	4	4.04	86	8.58
	N	99	100.00	1002	100.00
Phase	Primary	18	18.18	154	15.37
	Secondary	24	24.24	241	24.05
	Both	57	57.58	607	60.58
	N	99	100.00	1002	100.00
% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	1	1.01	16	1.60
	2nd lowest 20%	1	1.01	9	0.90
	Middle 20%	5	5.05	50	4.99
	2nd highest 20%	31	31.31	275	27.45
	Highest 20%	57	57.58	579	57.78
	Missing	4	4.04	73	7.29
	N	99	100.00	1002	100.00
% of pupils with statements (2005)	3-29%	1	1.01	5	0.50
	30% +	94	94.95	924	92.22
	Missing	4	4.04	73	7.29
	N	99	100.00	1002	100.00
Single sex/Coeducational schools	Boys	4	4.04	77	7.68
	Girls			4	0.40
	Mixed	95	95.96	906	90.42
	Missing			15	1.50
Total	N	99	100.00	1002	100.00

Table A4 Support staff telephone survey, ethnicity

Ethnic category	N=
Refused to provide ethnicity	13
White: - British	3027
White: - Irish	26
Another White background:	
- English	3
- Scottish	-
- Welsh	1
- European	34
- American/Canadian/Australian/Kiwi/South African	12
- Polish	6
- Other White background (please specify)	8
Another White background (TOTAL)	64
Total White	3117
Black: - Caribbean	17
Black: - African	8
Any other Black background:	
- Jamaican	1
- British	2
- Afro Caribbean	3
Any other Black background (TOTAL)	6
Mixed Background	13
Indian	38
Pakistani	17
Bangladeshi	6
Chinese	4
Any other Asian background (TOTAL)	14
Any other ethnic group (TOTAL)	8
Minority ethnic total	131

Highlighted in grey are those staff categorised as white
Overall sample N=3261

Table A5 Leaders survey, primary schools sample representativeness

		Sample		National	
		Count	%	Count	%
Government Office Region	North East	13	4.04	909	5.29
	North West/Merseyside	35	10.87	2529	14.71
	Yorkshire & The Humber	36	11.18	1854	10.79
	East Midlands	36	11.18	1678	9.76
	West Midlands	24	7.45	1816	10.57
	Eastern	48	14.91	2032	11.82
	London	30	9.32	1811	10.54
	South East	67	20.81	2646	15.39
	South West	33	10.25	1913	11.13
	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00*
School type	Infant/First	75	23.29	2777	16.16
	Primary/Combined	219	68.01	12847	74.74
	Junior	26	8.07	1464	8.52
	Middle	2	0.62	100	0.58
	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00*
% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	70	21.74	3625	21.09
	2nd lowest 20%	71	22.05	3407	19.82
	Middle 20%	64	19.88	3346	19.47
	2nd highest 20%	65	20.19	3290	19.14
	Highest 20%	51	15.84	3221	18.74
	Missing	1	0.31	299	1.74
	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00
Achievement Band (KS1 Overall performance 2002)	Lowest band	63	19.57	2960	17.22
	2nd lowest band	59	18.32	3106	18.07
	Middle band	54	16.77	3210	18.68
	2nd highest band	69	21.43	3241	18.86
	Highest band	63	19.57	3579	20.82
	Missing	14	4.35	1092	6.35
	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00
Size of school	Smallest 3rd	117	36.34	5710	33.22
	Middle 3rd	104	32.30	5664	32.95
	Largest 3rd	101	31.37	5696	33.14
	Missing			118	0.69
	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00
% of pupils with statements (2005)	None	80	24.84	3546	20.63
	1-2%	159	49.38	9447	54.96
	3-29%	82	25.47	3896	22.67
	Missing	1	0.31	299	1.74
	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00*
Single sex/Coeducational schools	Boys			3	0.02
	Girls			4	0.02
	Mixed	322	100.00	17142	99.73
	Missing			39	0.23
Total	N	322	100.00	17188	100.00

Keys: *: significant at the 5% level

N.B. Two schools in the sample are excluded as they cannot be matched to the population

Table A6 Leaders survey, secondary schools sample representativeness

		Sample		National	
		Count	%	Count	%
Government Office Region	North East	11	6.75	200	6.18
	North West/Merseyside	26	15.95	445	13.75
	Yorkshire & The Humber	10	6.13	308	9.51
	East Midlands	17	10.43	295	9.11
	West Midlands	18	11.04	388	11.99
	Eastern	17	10.43	412	12.73
	London	15	9.20	383	11.83
	South East	30	18.40	492	15.20
	South West	19	11.66	314	9.70
	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00
School type	Middle	10	6.13	236	7.29
	Comprehensive to 16	54	33.13	1191	36.79
	Comprehensive to 18	80	49.08	1496	46.22
	Other Secondary schools	7	4.29	151	4.66
	Grammar	12	7.36	163	5.04
	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00
% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	22	13.50	479	14.80
	2nd lowest 20%	56	34.36	832	25.70
	Middle 20%	39	23.93	851	26.29
	2nd highest 20%	34	20.86	664	20.51
	Highest 20%	12	7.36	411	12.70
	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00
Achievement Band (total GCSE point score 2005)	Lowest band	19	11.66	620	19.15
	2nd lowest band	36	22.09	638	19.71
	Middle band	30	18.40	630	19.46
	2nd highest band	32	19.63	604	18.66
	Highest band	36	22.09	517	15.97
	Missing	10	6.13	228	7.04
	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00
Size of school	Smallest 3rd	45	27.61	1080	33.36
	Middle 3rd	64	39.26	1080	33.36
	Largest 3rd	54	33.13	1077	33.27
	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00
% of pupils with statements (2005)	None	13	7.98	241	7.45
	1-2%	72	44.17	1663	51.37
	3-29%	78	47.85	1332	41.15
	Missing			1	0.03
	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00
Single sex/Coeducational schools	Boys	9	5.52	175	5.41
	Girls	14	8.59	220	6.80
	Mixed	140	85.89	2842	87.80
Total	N	163	100.00	3237	100.00

N.B. Two schools in the sample are excluded as they cannot be matched to the population

Table A7 Leaders survey, special schools sample representativeness

		Sample		National	
		Count	%	Count	%
Government Office Region	North East	11	8.33	62	6.19
	North West/Merseyside	21	15.91	164	16.37
	Yorkshire & The Humber	13	9.85	87	8.68
	East Midlands	8	6.06	81	8.08
	West Midlands	17	12.88	123	12.28
	Eastern	13	9.85	95	9.48
	London	19	14.39	142	14.17
	South East	24	18.18	162	16.17
	South West	6	4.55	86	8.58
	N	132	100.00	1002	100.00
Phase	Primary	22	16.67	154	15.37
	Secondary	34	25.76	241	24.05
	Both	76	57.58	607	60.58
	N	132	100.00	1002	100.00
% eligible FSM 2005 (5 pt scale)	Lowest 20%	1	0.76	16	1.60
	2nd lowest 20%	4	3.03	9	0.90
	Middle 20%	6	4.55	50	4.99
	2nd highest 20%	37	28.03	275	27.45
	Highest 20%	74	56.06	579	57.78
	Missing	10	7.58	73	7.29
	N	132	100.00	1002	100.00
% of pupils with statements (2005)	3-29%			5	0.50
	30% +	122	92.42	924	92.22
	Missing	10	7.58	73	7.29
	N	132	100.00	1002	100.00
Single sex/Coeducational schools	Boys	4	3.03	77	7.68
	Girls			4	0.40
	Mixed	128	96.97	906	90.42
	Missing			15	1.50
Total	N	132	100.00	1002	100.00

Table A8 Leaders survey, ethnicity

Ethnic category	N=
Refused to provide ethnicity	3
Not stated/not answered	10
More than one box ticked	1
White: - British	591
White: - Irish	5
Another White background:	
- English	-
- Scottish	-
- Welsh	-
- European	-
- American/Canadian/Australian/Kiwi/South African	2
- Polish	2
- Other White background	2
Another White background (TOTAL)	6
Total White	602
Black: - Caribbean	2
Black: - African	1
Any other Black background:	
- Other black background	1
Any other Black background (TOTAL)	1
Mixed Background	4
Indian	3
Pakistani	2
Bangladeshi	-
Chinese	-
Any other Asian background (TOTAL)	1
Any other ethnic group (TOTAL)	-
Minority ethnic total	14

Highlighted in grey are those staff categorised as white

Overall sample N=630

Appendix B. Questionnaires

B1 Support staff telephone questionnaire, Wave 2

SUPSTA (J33578) - Support Staff Experiences Post-pilot amendments FINAL (STH Wave 2) questionnaire 20.10.2008

Good morning/afternoon/evening. I'm from Ipsos MORI, the independent market and opinion research company. In collaboration with a team of independent researchers from the National Foundation for Educational Research, we're conducting research on behalf of the Training and Development Agency for Schools to explore the training and development needs of people working in schools. By training and development, we mean organised activities that lead to the development of your skills and knowledge, for example: external courses and school-based training.

In September, your school [provided us with (TEXT SUB IF SAMPLED SCHOOL PARTICIPATED IN STH WAVE 1: {confirmed}) (TEXT SUB IF SAMPLED SCHOOL PARTICIPATED IN STH WAVE 1 AND SAME RESPONDENT WAS INTERVIEWED: {agreed to take part in the survey again and confirmed})] the names of staff working in a supporting role, and your name was randomly selected, which is why I'm calling. The survey will take about 15 minutes to complete and all answers will be treated confidentially.

A	About your role
----------	------------------------

I'd like to begin by asking you a few questions about your role(s) at <INSERT SCHOOL NAME>.

ASK ALL EXCEPT <ROLE (OTHER) OR UNKNOWN> LEADS IN SAMPLE

A1. According to the information provided by the school, you currently work as what we're calling a(n) <INSERT ROLE FROM SAMPLE>, although your actual job title may be slightly different. Do you agree that you have this kind of role at the school?

INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY: We know this may not be your only role at the school, but is it one of your roles? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

ASK ALL <ROLE (OTHER) OR UNKNOWN> LEADS IN SAMPLE

A2a. Firstly, could you tell me what your role(s) is/are at this school? DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE FULLY. MULTICODE OK.

ASK ALL WHOSE INFORMATION IS INCORRECT (CODE 2 AT A1). OTHERS GO TO A3

A2b. In that case, could you tell me what your role(s) is/are at this school? DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE FULLY. MULTICODE OK.

SITE STAFF

Assistant cook
Caretaker
Catering assistant
Catering manager/Kitchen supervisor
Cleaner
Cook
Premises supervisor/manager
Site manager
Site staff (other)

ADMINISTRATION

Administrator
Bursar
Clerical assistant
Data manager
Examination invigilator
Examinations manager
Examinations officer
Finance officer
Finance technician
Office manager
Receptionist
School business manager
Secretary/PA
Administrative staff (other)

SPECIALIST AND TECHNICAL

Art and craft technician
Design and technology technician
Food technology technician
ICT manager
ICT technician
Laboratory technician
Librarian
Library/information assistant
Music specialist
Science technician
Textiles technician
Specialist/technical staff (other)

PUPIL SUPPORT

Behaviour mentor
 Careers adviser
 Connexions personal adviser
 Education welfare officer
 Extended school club worker/manager
 Health care assistant
 Home-school liaison officer
 Learning mentor
 Lunchtime supervisor
 Midday supervisor
 Out-of-school care worker/manager
 Physiotherapist
 Playworker
 Psychotherapist
 School Escort
 School nurse
 Speech Therapist
 Welfare assistant
 Pupil support staff (other)

LEARNING SUPPORT

Bilingual support assistant
 Classroom assistant
 Cover assistant
 Cover manager
 Cover supervisor
 Early years assistant
 Foundation stage assistant
 Higher level teaching assistant (HLTA)
 Learning support assistant
 Nursery nurse
 Special needs assistant
 Sports coach/technician
 Teaching assistant
 Learning support staff (other)

IF NO (CODE 2) AT A1 AND NONE OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN AT A2a FALL UNDER THE SAME STAFF TYPE (SEE HEADINGS IN CAPITALS IN CODE LIST AT A2a) AS THE INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE, OR NONE OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN AT A2b FALL UNDER THE SAME STAFF TYPE (SEE HEADINGS IN CAPITALS IN CODE LIST AT A2b) AS THE INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE THANK AND CLOSE INTERVIEW

IF AT LEAST ONE OF THE ANSWERS GIVEN AT A2a/b FALLS UNDER THE SAME STAFF TYPE (SEE HEADINGS IN CAPITALS IN CODE LIST AT A2a/b) AS THE INFORMATION ON THE SAMPLE, SCRIPT TO ASSIGN THAT ROLE TO BE ASKED ABOUT FOR REST OF THE INTERVIEW. INTERVIEWER READ OUT VERBATIM:

For the rest of the interview we'd like you to answer the questions based on your experience of training and development with reference to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE SELECTED FROM A2a/b RESPONSE>. You will have the opportunity to comment on training and development for any other role(s) you have at the end of the interview.

ASK ALL

A3. In your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, what type of employment contract do you have? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Permanent

Fixed-term/temporary

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

A4. In your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, do you work full-time or part-time? By full-time, I mean 30 hours per week or more. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Full-time

Part-time (including term-time only)

A4a. In your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, who is your employer? By “employer”, we mean the person, company or organisation who pays your wages or salary, not necessarily the place where you actually go to work. PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

I am employed by the school/the school's headteacher/the school's governors/the school's Governing Body

I am employed by the (local) authority/the (local) education authority/the education department/the (local) council

I am employed by a contractor/a private company that provides a service in/to the school

I am employed by an employment agency

I am self-employed

Other (please specify)

Don't know

A4b. In your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, how do you receive your wages or salary? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

You receive payments only during the school term and your contracted hours are term-time only

OR

You receive payments throughout the year but your contracted hours are term-time only

OR

You receive payments throughout the year and you are contracted to work 52 weeks a year INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY: **You may work in the school only during the school term OR during the school term and during the school holidays, or parts of the holidays.**

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

A5. What were you doing before taking up this role? INTERVIEWER PROMPT IF MORE THAN ONE THING: **What did you spend the most time doing?** PROBE FULLY. DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Working in this school in this role but on a voluntary basis
 Working in this school in a different role on a paid basis
 Working in this school in a different role on a voluntary basis
 Working in another school in this role on a paid basis
 Working in another school in this role on a voluntary basis
 Working in another school in a different role on a paid basis
 Working in another school in a different role on a voluntary basis
 Doing paid work outside of education/not in a school environment
 Doing voluntary work outside of education/not in a school environment
 Studying/training
 Not working
 Doing something else (please specify)
 Don't know

A7a. Altogether how long have you worked as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? Please include time spent in this role AT OTHER SCHOOLS, but not in other places of work, and please include any time you have been on a career break, for example, maternity or paternity leave, extended sick leave, carers leave and so on. INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY: **How long ago was it when you first ever took on the role of a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? SINGLE CODE ONLY**

Less than 6 months
 6 months or more, but less than a year
 1-2 years
 3-4 years
 5-9 years
 10 years or more
 Don't know

A7b. And altogether how long have you worked in your current school? Please include any time that you have worked in this school but in another role, and - again - please include any time you have been on a career break, for example, maternity or paternity leave, extended sick leave, carers leave and so on. INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY: **How long ago was it when you first joined the school? SINGLE CODE ONLY**

Less than 6 months
 6 months or more, but less than a year
 1-2 years
 3-4 years
 5-9 years
 10 years or more
 Don't know

B Skills and qualifications

I would now like to ask you a few questions about your qualifications and skills. I'd just like to remind you that all the answers you give are confidential and the questions are only being asked so we can make sure support staff from all backgrounds are included in the survey. So please don't worry if the next few questions don't feel very relevant to you. I'd like to reassure you that everything you tell us is useful, and we'll move onto the rest of the questions as soon as possible.

ASK ALL

B1. Do you have any maths qualifications? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

Don't know

Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO HAVE MATHS QUALIFICATIONS (CODE 1 AT B1). OTHERS GO TO B3

B2a. Please can you tell me which maths qualification(s) you have? PROBE FULLY, ESPECIALLY FOR QUALIFICATION LEVEL. DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

O-level (pass)

CSE [Certificate of Secondary Education] (grade 1)

CSE [Certificate of Secondary Education] (any other grade)

GCSE [General Certificate of Secondary Education] (grade A*, A, B or C)

GCSE [General Certificate of Secondary Education] (any other grade)

AS-level

A-level/A2-level

Adult Basic Skills in Numeracy, Level 2

Adult Basic Skills in Numeracy, Level 3

Keyskills in Application of Number, Level 2

Keyskills in Application of Number, Level 3

Scottish Standard Grade

Scottish Higher/Advanced Higher

Welsh Baccalaureate

International Baccalaureate

Other (please specify)

Don't know

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT HAVE A MATHS QUALIFICATION, DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE OR PREFER NOT TO SAY (CODES 2-4 AT B1). OTHERS GO TO B4

B3. Are you currently working towards a maths GCSE or any higher maths qualification? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

B4. Do you have any qualifications in English? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

Don't know

Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO HAVE QUALIFICATIONS IN ENGLISH (CODE 1 AT B4). OTHERS GO TO B6

B5a. Please can you tell me which English qualification(s) you have? PROBE FULLY, ESPECIALLY FOR QUALIFICATION LEVEL. DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

O-level (pass)

CSE [Certificate of Secondary Education] (grade 1)

CSE [Certificate of Secondary Education] (any other grade)

GCSE [General Certificate of Secondary Education] (grade A*, A, B or C)

GCSE [General Certificate of Secondary Education] (any other grade)

AS-level

A-level/A2-level

Adult Basic Skills in Literacy, Level 2

Adult Basic Skills in Literacy, Level 3

Keyskills in Communications, Level 2

Keyskills in Communications, Level 3

Scottish Standard Grade

Scottish Higher/Advanced Higher

Welsh Baccalaureate

International Baccalaureate

Other (please specify)

Don't know

ASK ALL WHO DO NOT HAVE AN ENGLISH QUALIFICATION, DON'T KNOW IF THEY HAVE OR PREFER NOT TO SAY (CODES 2-4 AT B4). OTHERS GO TO B6a

B6. Are you currently working towards an English GCSE or any higher qualification in English? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

B6a. Please can you tell me which of the following, if any, is the highest general academic qualification you have obtained? READ OUT. REVERSE ITEM LIST FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

GCSE Grades D-G

GCSE Grades A*-C

O-level pass or CSE at grade 1

CSE at any other grade

Scottish Standard Grade

AS or A2/A-level

Scottish Higher/Advanced Higher

Bachelor (undergraduate) degree

Masters (postgraduate) degree/PhD

None of these DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

B8a. Please may I check whether you are registered for, working towards, or have achieved, any of the following vocational or professional qualifications or statuses? READ OUT. ROTATE. SINGLE CODE ONLY PER ITEM

(i) Foundation degree

(ii) Certificate of School Business Management (CSBM)

(iii) Diploma of School Business Management (DSBM)

(iv) Support Work in Schools (SWiS) qualification

(v) NVQ for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools

(vi) NVQ for Teaching Assistants

(vii) Higher Level Teaching Assistant status

(viii) Qualified Teacher status

Yes - registered for/working towards

Yes - have achieved

No

Don't know

Prefer not to say

B8b. Are you registered for, working towards, or have you achieved, an NVQ or NVQs in any occupation (TEXT SUB IF CODE 1 AT QB8a(v) AND/OR QB8a(vi): {other than for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools or for Teaching Assistants}]]?
SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes - registered for/working towards
Yes - have achieved
No
Don't know
Prefer not to say

ASK ALL WORKING TOWARDS/WITH AN NVQ (CODE 1 AND 2 AT QB8b).
OTHERS GO TO QB8d

B8c. Please can you tell me the level you expect to achieve/have achieved in this NVQ?
INTERVIEWER ADD IF NECESSARY: **If you have more than one NVQ, please tell me the highest level you achieved.** DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Level 1
Level 2
Level 3
Level 4
Level 5
Any other response DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

B8d. And other than those I've mentioned, are you working towards, or have you achieved, any other vocational or professional qualifications or statuses relevant to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
No
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WITH SWiS (CODE 1 OR 2 AT QB8a(iv)). OTHERS GO TO QB8f

B8e. Thinking about your Support Work in Schools qualification, do you expect to achieve, or have you achieved, a ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Level 2 Award, Certificate
Level 3 Award, Certificate or Diploma
PSA Level 3, Certificate or Diploma
Level 2 and Level 3 DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WITH NVQ STLS (CODE 1 OR 2 AT QB8a(v)). OTHERS GO TO QB8g
B8f. Thinking about your NVQ for Supporting Teaching and Learning in Schools, do you expect to achieve, or have you achieved ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Level 2

Level 3

Level 2 and Level 3 DO NOT READ OUT

Any other response DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WITH NVQ TA (CODE 1 OR 2 AT QB8a(vi)). OTHERS GO TO QB10
B8g. Thinking about your NVQ for Teaching Assistants, do you expect to achieve, or have you achieved ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Level 2

Level 3

Level 2 and Level 3 DO NOT READ OUT

Any other response DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

B10. Now thinking about using computers in general, how confident are you ... ?
 READ OUT a)-c) AND SCALE. ROTATE a) TO c) AND REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

a) using e-mail?

b) using the internet?

c) that you can get access to a computer for e-mail/internet use when you need it in relation to your work as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>?

Very confident

Fairly confident

Not very confident

Not at all confident

OPTION FOR STATEMENT c) ONLY: I do not need it for my role DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

C	Performance Management
----------	-------------------------------

ASK ALL

C1. Who, if anyone, is involved in helping you to decide what training and development you need in your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? Just to remind you, by training and development we mean organised activities that lead to the development of your skills and knowledge. DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK. IF RESPONDENT SAYS LINE MANAGER, PROBE FOR POSITION/JOB ROLE USING PRE-CODES

Headteacher

Another senior member of the teaching staff (e.g. head of department/year, deputy head)

A class teacher

School training and development co-ordinator/Continuing Professional Development (CPD) co-ordinator

A senior member of the support staff (e.g. supervisor or equivalent) at the school

Another member of the support staff at the same level as me at the school

Someone else at the school (please specify)

Someone else not at the school (please specify)

No-one

Don't know

I don't need/want training and development

ASK ALL GIVING ONE RESPONSE FROM CODES 1-8 AT C1. CODES 9-11 GO TO C4

C2a. Is the person you mentioned your line manager? SINGLE CODE ONLY

ASK ALL GIVING TWO+ RESPONSES FROM CODES 1-8 AT C1. CODES 9-11 GO TO C4

C2b. Are any of the people you mentioned, your line manager? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

I don't have a line manager

I don't know what a line manager is

ASK ALL WHO GIVE TWO+ RESPONSES AT C1, ONE OF WHICH IS THEIR LINE MANAGER AT C2b (CODE 1). OTHERS GO TO C4

C3. Of the colleagues you mentioned, who is your line manager? SINGLE CODE ONLY

ONLY SHOW ANSWERS FROM C1

Headteacher

Another senior member of the teaching staff (e.g. head of department/year, deputy head)

A class teacher

School training and development co-ordinator/Continuing Professional Development (CPD) co-ordinator

A senior member of the support staff (e.g. supervisor or equivalent) at the school

Another member of the support staff at the same level as me at the school

Someone else at the school (please specify)

Someone else not at the school (please specify)

ASK ALL

C4. Is there a formal process or system in place, through which you are able to discuss your work as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes

No

Don't know

I don't need/want to discuss my work DO NOT READ OUT

ASK IF YES AT C4 (CODE 1 AT C4). OTHERS GO TO C6

C5. And how useful, if at all, do you find this process or system in helping to identify your training and development needs? SINGLE CODE ONLY. READ OUT SCALE. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE

Very useful

Fairly useful

Not very useful

Not at all useful

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

C6. When you want to apply for training and development, who do you need to get permission from? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

Headteacher

Line manager

Another senior member of the teaching staff (e.g. head of department/year, deputy head)

A class teacher

School training and development co-ordinator/Continuing Professional Development (CPD) co-ordinator

A senior member of the support staff (e.g. supervisor or equivalent) at the school

Another member of the support staff at the same level as me at the school

Someone else at the school (please specify)

Someone else not at the school (please specify)

No-one, I decide SINGLE CODE ONLY

Don't know SINGLE CODE ONLY

It depends/can't generalise SINGLE CODE ONLY

I don't need/want to apply for training and development DO NOT READ OUT

C7. Overall, how supported do you feel by your school, if at all, in terms of meeting your training and development needs? READ OUT SCALE. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Very well supported

Fairly well supported

Not very supported

Not at all supported

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

I don't need/want training and development DO NOT READ OUT

D Perceptions and Awareness

ASK ALL

D1. People undertake training and development for a number of reasons. Please tell me how important each of the following is to you. READ OUT a) TO g) AND SCALE.

ROTATE a)-g) AND REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

- a) To support you in carrying out your current role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>
- b) To help you with career progression (promotion) in your current role
- c) To enable you to move into a different job to the one you do now
- d) To achieve higher pay
- e) To be able to take on greater responsibilities
- f) To increase job satisfaction
- g) To help with self-development

Very important

Fairly important

Not very important

Not at all important

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

I don't need/want to undertake training and development DO NOT READ OUT

D2. What, if anything, gets in the way of you taking part in training and development opportunities? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

Difficult personal circumstances

I am on a short contract

I don't know how to apply

I don't know what I need

I don't know what is available

I don't think what is available is relevant to me

I don't speak very good English

I feel I'm too old/too close to retirement

I get very nervous/self-conscious in front of other people

I'm not interested in training and development

I'm worried about my reading and writing skills

Lack of encouragement from my manager/person who makes the decisions

Lack of funding available for training

Other commitments/demands on my time

Previous negative experience of training

Travel/ transport difficulties

Nothing stops me SINGLE CODE ONLY

Other (please specify)

Don't know SINGLE CODE ONLY

I don't need/want to take part in training and development

D4. In which one of the following ways, if any, would you prefer to receive information about training and development opportunities? READ OUT a)-c). ROTATE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

a) Other printed material (e.g. flyers, brochures)

b) Online/internet

c) E-mail

None of these DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

Do not want to receive information about training and development DO NOT READ OUT

D4b. If you wanted information on training and development opportunities which were relevant to you and your role a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, which, if any, organisations would you use to provide the information? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

My school

My employer

A college/university

A private training provider

Local Cluster

School CPD Networks

Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC)

Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF)/Department for Education and Skills (DfES)

Learndirect

Learning and Skills Council (LSC)

Local Authority

National College for School Leadership (NCSL)

Ofsted

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA)

Sector Skills Development Agency (SSDA)

Teachers' TV

Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA)

Trade Union (e.g. UNISON and Skillsforyou)

Other (please specify)

I would not look for information about training and development DO NOT READ OUT

I don't need/want information about training and development DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

E Training and Development Experiences

ASK ALL

E1. Thinking about when you first started working as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>at your current school, which of the following did you receive, if any? READ OUT a)-g).
 ROTATE b)-g). ITEM a) ALWAYS TO BE READ OUT FIRST. MULTICODE OK

a) **An introduction to your line manager** ONLY SHOW IN CATISCRIPIT IF
 RESPONDENT HAS A LINE MANAGER (CODE 1 AT C2a/b)

b) **A job description**

c) **An opportunity to discuss your training and development needs**

d) **An introduction to the pupils you would be working with**

e) **A tour of the school site and facilities**

f) **An introduction to school policies, for example, behaviour management**

g) **Information about school procedures, for example, fire drills**

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

Can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

Not applicable DO NOT READ OUT

E2. Over the last 12 months, have you received any of the following types of training and development in relation to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? READ OUT a)-g).
 ROTATE. SINGLE CODE ONLY FOR EACH

a) **Improving or updating your basic skills (reading and writing, maths, Information and Communications Technology/ICT)**

b) **Managing children and young people's behaviour/pupil discipline**

c) **Safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection**

d) **Skills and knowledge directly related to your role as an <INSERT ROLE>**

e) **Understanding the curriculum or supporting a subject area or key stage**

f) **Working with children and young people with Special Educational Needs**

g) **Training in integrated/multi-agency working**

Yes

No

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

Can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO RECEIVED TWO+ TRAINING IN LAST 12 MONTHS FROM STATEMENTS AT E2. ALL ANSWERING YES (CODE 1) TO ONE STATEMENT ONLY AT E2, GO TO E4a. OTHERS GO TO F1

E3. And of these, which type of training and development in relation to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE> did you receive most recently? READ OUT a) TO g). SINGLE CODE ONLY

ONLY SHOW ANSWERS FROM E2

- a) Improving or updating your basic skills (reading and writing, maths, Information and Communications Technology/ICT)
- b) Managing children and young people's behaviour/pupil discipline
- c) Safeguarding children and promoting their welfare/child protection
- d) Skills and knowledge directly related to your role as an <INSERT ROLE>
- e) Understanding the curriculum or supporting a subject area or key stage
- f) Working with children and young people with Special Educational Needs
- g) Training in integrated/multi-agency working

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

Can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL WHO SAY YES ONLY ONCE AT E2.

E4a. Is this training and development in relation to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE> ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

ASK ALL WHO HAVE RECEIVED TWO+ TRAINING AND REMEMBER WHICH THEIR MOST RECENT TRAINING COURSE IS (CODES 1-7 AT E3). OTHERS GO TO F1

E4b. Is the most recent training and development you've received in relation to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE> ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

Finished

On-going/still underway

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

I'd now like to ask you a few questions about this example of training.

E5. Where [did (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: {does})] this training and development take place? DO NOT READ OUT. PROBE FULLY USING PRE-CODES AS PROMPTS IF REQUIRED. MULTICODE OK

At your school, in INSET time

At your school, in non-INSET time

At your school, don't know if in INSET/non-INSET time

At another school

At a college/university

At the local authority's offices/premises

At your employers' offices/premises

At your home (distance learning)

Somewhere else (please specify)

Don't know/can't remember DO NOT READ OUT

E6. Who [provided (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: {is providing})] the training and development? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK

Your learning coach or mentor
 Your line manager
 Another member of the support staff at your school
 Another member of the teaching staff at your school
 A member of the support staff from another school
 A member of the teaching staff from another school
 Staff from a college/university
 Staff from the local authority
 Another provider/organisation
 Someone else (please specify)
 Don't know/can't remember

E7. [Was (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: {Is})] the training and development intended to lead to a formal qualification/status? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes (please specify)
 No
 Don't know

ASK THOSE WHO UNDERTOOK/ARE UNDERTAKING TRAINING INTENDED TO LEAD TO A FORMAL QUALIFICATION/STATUS (CODE 1 AT E7). OTHERS GO TO E9

E8. [Did you gain/were you (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b: {Do you expect to gain/be})] awarded the qualification/status? SINGLE CODE ONLY

Yes
 No
 Don't know

E9. Overall, how would you rate the quality of this training and development? Would you say it [was (TEXT SUB IF CODE 2 AT E4a/b) {is})] ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE

Very good
 Fairly good
 Fairly poor
 Very poor
 Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

E10. Overall, how would you rate this training and development in meeting your needs for your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>? Would you say it was ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY. REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE

Very good
 Fairly good
 Fairly poor
 Very poor
 Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

E11. What, if any, have been the benefits of this training and development to you? DO NOT READ OUT. MULTICODE OK.

Enabled me to take on greater responsibilities
Has/could enable me to move into a different or new role
Helped in meeting performance review objectives
Helped me to achieve higher pay
Helped me to communicate better with other staff
Helped me with career progression (promotion) in my current role
Helped with my self-development
Helped with my confidence
Improved my job satisfaction
Improved my relationship with/understanding of teachers in my school
Improved outcomes for the children/young people I work with
Supported me in carrying out my current role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>
Other (please specify)
Too early to say
No benefits
Don't know

ASK ALL WHO IDENTIFY MORE THAN ONE BENEFIT AT QE11, pre-codes 1-10.
OTHERS GO TO F1

QE11a. And of these, what would you say has been the MAIN benefit? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

ONLY SHOW ANSWERS FROM E11

**Enabled me to take on greater responsibilities
Has/could enable me to move into a different or new role
Helped in meeting performance review objectives
Helped me to achieve higher pay
Helped me to communicate better with other staff
Helped me with career progression (promotion) in my current role
Helped with my self-development
Helped with my confidence
Improved my job satisfaction
Improved my relationship with/understanding of teachers in my school
Improved outcomes for the children/young people I work with
Supported me in carrying out my current role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>
Other (please specify)
Don't know**

F	About You
----------	------------------

ASK IF MORE THAN ONE ROLE AT A2a/b OR ON THE SAMPLE. OTHERS GO TO F3
F1. So far we have been talking about your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE> but you have (an)other role(s). Compared to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, would you say your experience of training and development for your other role(s) differs ... ? READ OUT.
 REVERSE SCALE FOR 50% OF SAMPLE. SINGLE CODE ONLY

A great deal

To some extent

Not very much

Not at all

It depends/can't generalise DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

I don't have another role DO NOT READ OUT

I haven't had any training and development for my other roles DO NOT READ OUT

I don't need any training and development for my other roles DO NOT READ OUT

ASK IF EXPERIENCE DIFFERS A GREAT DEAL/TO SOME EXTENT (CODES 1 AND 2 AT F1). OTHERS GO TO F2b

F2. What, if any, are the main ways in which your experience of training and development for your other role(s) differs? PROMPT IF NEEDED **This could be in relation to how your needs are identified or being informed about training and development opportunities or your experiences of training and development.**

ENTER VERBATIM

Don't know

ASK IF MORE THAN ONE ROLE AT A2a/b OR ON THE SAMPLE AND DO NOT SAY "I DON'T HAVE ANOTHER ROLE" AT QF1. OTHERS GO TO F3

F2b. And in your other role(s), do you receive ... ? READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

The same rate of pay as you receive in your role as <INSERT ROLE>

OR

A different rate of pay as you receive in your role as <INSERT ROLE>

A mix, depending on the role DO NOT READ OUT

Don't know DO NOT READ OUT

ASK ALL

F3. Could you tell me how old you are? DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

18-24

25-34

35-44

45-54

55-64

65+

Refused

QF3a. Thinking about the language(s) you might speak, do you speak English or another language most often at home? SINGLE CODE ONLY

English
Another language
Prefer not to say
Don't know

QF3b. Returning (for the last time) to your role as a(n) <INSERT ROLE>, would you say that you are able to ... ? READ OUT a) TO c). ROTATE a)-c). SINGLE CODE ONLY

a. Read English as well as you need for this role
b. Speak English as well as you need for this role
c. Write English as well as you need for this role

Yes
No
Prefer not to say DO NOT READ OUT
Don't know

F4. Finally, which ethnic group do you consider yourself to belong to? DO NOT READ OUT. SINGLE CODE ONLY

White
British
Irish
Another White background (please specify)

Black or Black British
Caribbean
African
Any other Black background (please specify)

Mixed
White and Black Caribbean
White and Black African
White and Asian
Any other Mixed background (please specify)

Asian or Asian British
Indian
Pakistani
Bangladeshi
Any other Asian background (please specify)

Chinese or Other ethnic groups
Chinese
Any other ethnic group

Refused

F5. INTERVIEWER RECORD GENDER

Male
Female

B2 Leaders survey questionnaire

A. About yourself

1. What is your job title?

2. In total, how many years have you been in your current role:

Years (Please write in the number of years)

3. Do you work part-time or full-time (35 hours per week or more)?

(Please tick one box)

Part-time ☐ ¹ Full-time ☐ ² Prefer not to say ☐ ³

B. Deployment of support staff and future planning in your school

- 4a. Please rank (from 1 to 6) the following factors in order of importance in determining the roles and responsibilities of the support staff in your school.

Please put one number (1-6) into each box below, with 1 being the **most** important factor and 6 the **least** important factor.

Skills and knowledge of individual support staff	<input type="text"/>
Staff shortages in certain areas	<input type="text"/>
To enable professional development of support staff	<input type="text"/>
To meet the needs of individual pupils	<input type="text"/>
To meet the school's National Agreement obligations	<input type="text"/>
To meet the priorities identified in the school's improvement plan	<input type="text"/>

- 4b.** How confident is the senior leadership that the school will be able to adapt the roles and responsibilities of the following support staff, as desired to meet the school's priorities?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Very confident 1	Quite confident 2	Not very confident 3	Not at all confident 4	Don't Know 5
Site staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist and technical staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching assistants or equivalent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 5a.** Please indicate which category of support staff you think will have an increasingly important role to play for each of the following developments over the next three years.

(Please select **one support staff** category per row)

	Site staff 1	Administrative staff 2	Specialist and technical staff 3	Teaching assistants 4	Pupil support staff 5	Learning support staff 6
Improving the outcomes for children and young people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivering personalised services to young people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Liaising with other children's services, agencies and practitioners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Liaising with parents/carers and families	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil attainment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Empowering children, families and young people to take responsibility for their outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 5b.** In order to meet your school's priorities, what degree of growth do you anticipate in the number of hours for the following groups of support staff over the next three years?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Substantial growth 1	Some growth 2	Little growth 3	No growth 4	Don't know 5
Site staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist and technical staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching assistants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C. Professional development of support staff in your school

- 6.** How confident are you that your school has been able to identify the professional development needs of each of the following groups of support staff?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Very confident 1	Quite confident 2	Not very confident 3	Not at all confident 4	Don't know 5	Not applicable 6
Site staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist and technical staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching assistants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 7a.** To what extent have you been able to access training and development provision, over the last 12 months, to meet the identified needs of the following groups of support staff?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	To a large extent	To some extent	Rarely	Not at all	Don't know	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Site staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Administrative staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Specialist and technical staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching assistants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupil support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learning support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 7b.** If you selected 'rarely' or 'not at all' for any of the support staff roles in 7a, please provide a brief summary of why you have not been able to access training and development provision for these role types.

8. Considering your school's priorities over the next three years, please indicate the **single** most important area for professional development, for each of the groups of support staff.

(Please tick **one box** in each **column**)

	Site staff	Administrative staff	Specialist and technical staff	Teaching assistants	Pupil support staff	Learning support staff
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Role-specific expertise or knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General curriculum knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
English/literacy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maths/numeracy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ICT skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Safeguarding children and promoting their welfare and independence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Behaviour management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Basic skills (e.g. first aid handling and lifting)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrated/multi-agency working	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
English as an additional language (EAL)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Working with parents and carers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Considering the following types of professional development activities which might be available to support staff in your school, please indicate which of these you think are **most** effective for their professional development in each of the following areas:

(Please tick **one** box in each row)

	NVQ or equivalent 1	Found- ation degree 2	Other accredited qualification 3	Externally provided training 4	In- house training 5	On-the- job activities 6	School induction training 7	Self directed learning 8
Role-specific expertise or knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
General curriculum knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
English/literacy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Maths/numeracy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ICT skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Safeguarding children and promoting their welfare and independence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Behaviour management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Special Educational Needs (SEN)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Basic skills (e.g. first aid handling and lifting)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrated/multi-agency working	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
English as an additional language (EAL)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Working with parents and carers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D. Training opportunities

10a. When selecting an external provider of training and development, to what extent are the following factors important in enabling this selection?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Always important	Sometimes important	Not often important	Not important	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5
Link to professional/occupational standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practical training as opposed to theoretical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence of positive impact of training in own or other schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
External funding available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training as organised by the LA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accessible location	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appropriateness of mode of training (e.g. online, face-to-face)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10b. Please choose from the following factors your **top four** considerations when selecting an external provider of training and development, and then rank them (from 1 to 4) in order of importance, with 1 being the **most** important factor and 4 the **least** important factor.

Link to professional/occupational standards	<input type="checkbox"/>
Practical training as opposed to theoretical	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence of positive impact of training in own or other schools	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost of training	<input type="checkbox"/>
External funding available	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training as organised by the LA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accessible location	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appropriateness of mode of training (e.g. online, face-to-face)	<input type="checkbox"/>

E. Barriers to professional development

11. Previous research with senior school leaders on support staff has identified funding as a barrier to their training. How frequently do you face the following funding issues in your school?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Very frequently	Quite frequently	Not very frequently	Hardly ever/not at all	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5
My school does not have specific funding for support staff training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The local authority does not fund training for support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The school cannot pay staff for their time when training takes place outside of their contracted hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local authority funding pays for training but not cover for support staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funding applications are complex and time-consuming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Locating alternative funding sources is difficult	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Previous research with senior school leaders has identified that releasing staff can be a barrier to their training. How frequently do you face the following issues in your school?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Very frequently	Quite frequently	Not very frequently	Hardly ever/not at all	Not applicable
	1	2	3	4	5
Cover is not available for support staff undertaking training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cover for support staff is difficult to organise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cover for support staff undertaking training has a disruptive impact on pupils/the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My school cannot fund cover for support staff while they undertake training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Releasing support staff when several need the same training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Senior school leaders have identified that the timing of training can be a barrier to participation by support staff. How frequently are the following a barrier in your school?

(Please tick **one box** in each row)

	Very frequently 1	Quite frequently 2	Not very frequently 3	Hardly ever/not at all 4	Not applicable 5
Training usually takes place outside support staff's contracted hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Training usually takes place within support staff's contracted hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finding sufficient time for training within part-time support staff's hours	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The total amount of time the appropriate training activity takes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

F. More about you

14. Which ethnic group do you consider yourself to belong to?

(Please tick the appropriate box)

White:

British ☐ 1 Irish ☐ 2

Another White background (please specify) ☐ 5

Black or Black British:

Caribbean ☐ 3 African ☐ 4

Any other Black background (please specify) ☐ 6

Mixed:

White and Black Caribbean ☐ 7

White and Black African ☐ 8

White and Asian ☐ 9

Any other Mixed background (please specify) ☐ 10

Asian or Asian British:

Indian ☐ 11

Pakistani ☐ 12

Bangladeshi ☐ 13

Any other Asian background (please specify) ☐ 14

Chinese ☐ 15 Prefer not to say ☐ 16 Any other Ethnic group ☐ 17

(please specify)

F. More about you (continued):

15. What is your age? (Please tick one box)				16. Please indicate your gender			
18-24	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	25-34	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Male	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
35-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	45-54	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Female	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
55-64	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	65+	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Transgender	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
Prefer not to say			<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Prefer not to say <input type="checkbox"/> 4		

17. Do you meet the Disability Discrimination Act definition of disability?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2 Not sure ☐ 3 Prefer not to say ☐ 4

18. Would you be willing to participate in further research?

Yes ☐ 1 No ☐ 2

If yes, please provide your name and contact number.

Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss/Dr _____

Daytime contact no

Appendix C. Regression analysis

C1.1 Explanation of regression analysis for Wave 2 of the telephone survey

Regression is a technique that predicts the values of some measure of interest given the values of one or more related measures. In our case the regression analysis allowed us to build on the basic descriptive work by considering the effect of background variables on each of the factor scores (or outcomes) once other background variables had been controlled for.

The factor analyses produced the following factors:

- having a qualification in mathematics (GCSE or better)*
- having a qualification in English (GCSE or better)*
- highest achieved academic qualification as AS level or above*
- number of vocational/professional qualifications
- registered for/ working towards or have achieved SWiS qualification*
- confidence in ICT
- staff involved in deciding training & development
- having a line manager involved in deciding your training and development*
- experience of performance management
- level of support in meeting training & development needs
- importance of personal development as a reason for taking part in training
- importance of career advancement as a reason for taking part in training
- barriers to personal development
- sources of information on training & development
 - number of sources
 - government sources*
 - local sources*
 - other sources*
- role specific inductions
- having training in the last 12 months*
- pupil-focused training and development

- multiple benefits of training
- satisfaction and relevance with training and development.

Each of these factors was used as an outcome in the regression analysis, so in total twenty-two regression models were run controlling for a number of staff- and school-level variables⁸⁵. A full list of background variables and the details of which questions fed into each of the factors is given in Appendix C2.

For some (see * above) of these outcomes, the analysis looked at both the strength of relationships between various background variables and the outcome, and the relative change in the outcome, for a change in the background variable. In the regression analyses, there are two types of values of interest – the Beta and B values. B values indicate the change in the outcome for a change of one unit in the background variable. Therefore, larger B values (both negative and positive) indicate the background variables that result in the greatest change in the outcome. The B scores are then standardised, that is the variation around the variable is considered, and the resultant figures are called standardised coefficients or ‘Beta’ values. The Beta values show which predictors are most closely associated with the outcome. The Beta values can be interpreted in a similar way to the B values. The larger the Beta value (either positive or negative) the stronger the relationship is between the background variable and the outcome.

The remaining models specifically looked at the likelihood of achieving the outcome. For instance, ‘Having a line manager involved in deciding your training and development’ made use of a logistic regression model since the outcome was binary (yes/no). The data presented for this regression model considers the odds of achieving this outcome compared to other groups. Figures greater than 1 imply a greater chance, or greater odds, of achieving the outcome whilst figures below 1 indicate that the group in question is less likely to have their line manager involved in helping to decide their training and development.

⁸⁵ The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself.

The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. The background variables we would recommend be treated with caution are:

- age refused
- aged 65+ years (65+)
- did not know contract
- employed by other
- did not know employer
- did not know how wages were paid
- self-assessed proficiency in English.

C1.2 Explanation of regression analysis for change over time

For the support staff telephone survey there were a number of questions in common to both Wave 1 and Wave 2. To assess whether there had been any change over time in the views of various subgroups of support staff, regression models were run on these common questions (or factors as appropriate). In addition to the background variables controlled for in the Wave 1 and Wave 2 regression modelling, interaction terms combining the background factor and Wave were included, to establish whether there had been any statistically significant change for the factor in question.

In total fifteen regression models were run:

- having a qualification in mathematics (GCSE or better)*
- having a qualification in English (GCSE or better)*
- confidence in ICT
- staff involved in deciding training and development
- having a line manager involved in training and development*
- experience of performance management
- level of support in meeting training and development needs
- importance of personal development as a reason for taking part in training

- importance of career advancement as a reason for taking part in training
- number of barriers to personal development
- number of induction activities into current role
- having training in the last 12 months*
- number of benefits of training
- satisfaction and relevance with training and development
- pupil-focused training and development.

In line with the Wave 2 regression models, all but four (see * above) of these regressions made use of the analysis looking at both the strength of relationships between various background variables and the outcome, and the relative change in the outcome, for a change in the background variable. Therefore both the B and Beta values were considered but only the Beta values are presented here as they describe the strength of the relationship between the outcome and the background variable once other variables have been controlled for.

The models for the remaining outcomes specifically looked at the likelihood of achieving the outcome. For instance, 'Having a line manager involved in deciding your training and development' made use of a logistic regression model since the outcome was binary (yes/no). The data presented for this regression model considers the odds of achieving this outcome compared to other groups.

C1.3 Explanation of regression analysis for the leaders survey

In line with the methodology used for the support staff survey, we also used regression modelling with the leaders survey to build on the descriptive statistics. This allowed us to consider the effect of background variables on each of the factor scores (or outcomes) once other background variables had been controlled for.

Factor analysis run on the leaders survey produced seventeen regression outcomes:

- factors determining the roles and responsibilities of support staff

- confidence in school being able to adapt the roles and responsibilities
- degree of growth expected in the hours of support staff over the next three years
- confidence in identifying the development needs of support staff
- the extent to which training and development provision had been accessed
- the most important areas for professional development, including:
 - core curriculum subjects
 - other subjects
 - SEN and welfare.
- factors that were important when selecting an external provider of training and development, including:
 - the importance placed on professional standards
 - the importance placed on applicability and relevance
 - the importance placed on financial resources
 - the importance placed on location and provider.
- funding and support staff training, including:
 - funding - local issues
 - funding - access issues.
- being able to release staff for training
- the timing of training, in relation to:
 - support staff's contracted hours
 - the availability of time.

For all of these outcomes, the analysis looked at both the strength of relationships between various background variables and the outcome and the relative change in the outcome for a change in the background variable. Therefore both the B and Beta values were considered but only the Beta values are presented as they describe the strength of the relationship between the outcome and the background variable once other variables have been controlled for.

The significance of relationships with some background variables needs to be treated with caution where the numbers in the subgroup are small. The significance of such results may be affected by the small number of people in the subgroup rather than there being a strong relationship between the group and the outcome itself. The background variables we would recommend be treated with caution are:

- disability
- minority ethnic group
- part-time contract.

C2 Regression variables

Table C2.1 Telephone survey: regression variables for Wave 2 analysis

Variable labels/predictors	Comparators
Administrative staff, special and technical staff, pupil support staff and, learning support staff, teaching assistant	Site staff
Multirole	Not multirole
Male	Female
18-24, 25-34, 45-54, 55-64, 65+, Age refused	35-44
Minority ethnic staff	White
Working full-time	Part-time
Fixed term/temporary contract, don't know	Permanent
Employer, other, don't know, school	Local authority
Wages paid term-time, hours term-time and all year, hours all year, don't know	Payments all year, hours term-time
Time in role 3-4 years, 5-9 years, 10 years or more	0-2 years
Time at school 3-4 years, 5-9 years, 10 years or more	0-2 years
Have mathematics qualification at GCSE level C or above	No mathematics qualification at GCSE level C or above
Have English qualification at GCSE level C or above	No English qualification at GCSE level C or above
Highest general academic qualification achieved is at AS level or above	Highest general academic qualification achieved is below AS level
Number of vocational/professional qualifications registered for/working towards/achieved*	
Deficient in reading or writing in relation to role, Deficient in reading and writing in relation to role*	No deficiency
Secondary schools, special schools	Primary schools
School size, middle 3 rd and largest 3 rd	Smallest 3 rd
Schools with higher FSM entitlement*	
Schools with higher SEN*	
Schools with higher EAL*	
Schools in North East, North West/ Merseyside, Yorkshire & Humber, East Midlands, West Midlands, Eastern, London, South West	South East
Schools in London Borough, metropolitan authorities, English unitary authorities	Counties
Rural schools	Non-rural
Achievement, 2 nd lowest quintile, middle quintile, 2 nd highest quintile, highest quintile	Lowest quintile
Number of extended services available*	

*Numerical variable (no comparator)

Table C2.2 Telephone survey: regression variables for change over time analysis

Variable labels/predictors	Comparators
Administrative staff, special and technical staff, pupil support staff, learning support staff, teaching assistant	Site staff
Multirole	Not multirole
Male	Female
18-24, 25-34, 45-54, 55-64, 65+, Refused	35-44
Minority ethnic staff	White
Work full-time	Part-time
Fixed term/temporary contract , don't know type of contract	Permanent
Employer is school, other, don't know	Local authority
Time in role more than 2 years	2 years or less
Have mathematics qualification at GCSE level C or above	No mathematics qualification at GCSE level C or above
Have English qualification at GCSE level C or above	No English qualification at GCSE level C or above
Work in secondary schools, special schools	Primary
School size middle 3 rd , largest 3 rd	Smallest 3 rd
Schools with higher FSM entitlement*	
Schools with higher SEN entitlement*	
Schools with higher EAL entitlement*	
Schools in the North, South	The midlands
Schools in London Borough, metropolitan authorities, English unitary authorities	Counties
Rural schools	Non-rural
Achievement, 2 nd lowest quintile, Middle quintile, 2 nd highest quintile, highest quintile	Lowest quintile
Boys school, girls school	Mixed
Wave 2	Wave 1
Interaction terms between time and the variable	

*Numerical variable (no comparator)

Table C2.3 Leaders survey: regression variables

Variable labels/predictors	Comparators
Role, deputy headteacher or equivalent, bursar, other role	Headteacher
More time in role*	
Male	Female
18-44 and 55-64	45-54
Have disability	No disability
Minority ethnic staff	White
Working part time	Full time
Secondary schools, special schools	Primary schools
Larger schools*	
Schools with higher FSM entitlement*	
Schools with higher SEN entitlement*	
Schools with higher EAL entitlement*	
Schools in North East, North West/ Merseyside, Yorkshire & Humber, East Midlands, West Midlands, Eastern, London and South West	South East
Schools in London boroughs, metropolitan authorities, English unitary authorities	Counties
Rural schools	Urban
Achievement, 2 nd lowest quintile, middle quintile, 2 nd highest quintile, highest quintile	Lowest quintile
More extended services*	
Administrative staff, special and technical staff, teaching assistant, pupil support staff, learning support staff	Site staff

*Numerical variable (no comparator)

C3 Support staff telephone survey: Wave 2 regression tables

Table C3.1 Mathematics qualifications

Variable:	Odds ratio ⁸⁶
English qualification	22.54
Higher academic qualification	3.00
Specialist and technical staff	1.93
Men	1.74
Administrative staff	1.68
Teaching assistants	1.42
Vocational qualifications	1.39
At school for 10+	0.76

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions B1 and B2a of the telephone survey. If anyone involved had a mathematics qualification at GCSE grade C or better this was indicated by a score of one on this factor. Those who did not have such a qualification had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having a mathematics qualification at GCSE grade C or better.

Table C3.2 English qualifications

Variable:	Odds ratio
Mathematics qualification	21.84
Administrative staff	6.83
Learning support staff	5.86
Teaching assistants	5.40
Specialist and technical staff	3.86
18-24 years	3.20
Higher academic qualification	2.87
Pupil support staff	2.86
Rural schools	1.54
65+ years	0.23
55-64 years	0.47
Employed by school	0.62
More than one role	0.71
More extended school services	0.71
% pupils eligible for FSM	0.99

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions B4 and B5a of the telephone survey. If anyone involved had an English qualification at GCSE grade C or better this was indicated by a score of one on this factor. Those who did not have such a qualification had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having an English qualification at GCSE grade C or better.

⁸⁶ An odds ratio of 1 implies that the event is equally likely in the group in question as the base group. An odds ratio greater than one implies that the event is more likely for the group in question. An odds ratio less than one implies that the event is less likely in the group.

Table C3.3 Highest academic qualification

Variable:	Odds ratio
English qualification	3.34
Mathematics qualification	3.15
Specialist and technical staff	2.17
Secondary schools	1.88
Minority ethnic staff	1.79
18-24 years	1.65
25-34 years	1.47
Men	1.43
Achievement – 2 nd highest quintile	1.33
Vocational qualifications	1.11
% EAL	1.01
% SEN	1.01
At school for 10 years +	0.57
At school for 5-9 years	0.68
At school for 3-4 years	0.73
% FSM	0.99

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions B6a of the telephone survey. If anyone involved had a qualification at AS level or above this was indicated by a score of one on this factor. Those who did not have a qualification at AS level or above had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having a general academic qualification at AS level or better.

Table C3.4 Vocational/professional qualifications

Variable:	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.30
Learning support staff	0.19
Mathematics qualification	0.11
Pupil support staff	0.07
At school for 10 years +	0.07
Full-time	0.06
South West	0.05
At school for 5-9 years	0.05
English qualification	0.05
Wages term-time and hours term-time	0.03
More than one role	0.03
In role for 10 years +	-0.07
18-24 years	-0.04
Men	-0.04

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions B8a of the telephone survey. Each qualification was given a point, so a score of six on this factor indicates that the respondent had six vocational/ professional qualifications. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate larger number of vocational/ professional qualifications registered for, working towards or had achieved.

Table C3.5 SWiS qualification

Variable:	Odds ratio
Vocational qualifications	6.50
More than one role	1.92
Pupil support staff	1.85
Unitary authority	1.61
Mid-sized school	1.58
% FSM	1.01
Higher academic qualifications	0.53
Mathematics qualification	0.56

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions B8a item (iv) of the telephone survey. A score of one on this factor indicates the respondent was registered for, working towards or had achieved the Support Work in Schools (SWiS) qualification. Those who did not have this qualification had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups registered for, working towards or had achieved the SWiS qualification.

Table C3.6 Confidence in ICT

Variable:	Beta
Administrative staff	0.46
Teaching assistants	0.37
Specialist and technical staff	0.29
Learning support staff	0.29
Pupil support staff	0.17
English qualification	0.14
Men	0.11
Full-time	0.10
Secondary schools	0.07
Higher academic qualification	0.07
Vocational qualifications	0.06
Rural	0.04
Employment other	0.03
55-64 years	-0.14
65 + years	-0.14
45-54 years	-0.09
Did not know type of contract	-0.04
Minority ethnic staff	-0.04
North East	-0.03
At school for 5-9 years	-0.03
Age refused	-0.03

This factor was derived by considering question B10 of the telephone survey. The scoring of the items (use of email and the internet and access to ICT) was reversed so a greater perception of confidence in ICT is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this item.

Table C3.7 Staff involved in deciding training and development

Variable:	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.29
Learning support staff	0.25
Administrative staff	0.16
Pupil support staff	0.14
Specialist and technical staff	0.05
Employed by 'other'	-0.07
Secondary schools	-0.06
% EAL	-0.06
65 years +	-0.05
Don't know how wages paid	-0.04
Achievement – middle quintile	-0.04

This factor is a sum of question C1 in the telephone survey. Each person involved in deciding training and development was given a point, so a score of six for an individual on this factor indicates that they had six people involved in helping decide their training and development. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate the involvement of a greater number of people.

Table C3.8 Have line manager involved in training and development

Variable:	Odds ratio
Administrative staff	2.09
Teaching assistants	1.75
Learning support staff	1.60
Full-time	1.33
Wages paid all year, hours all year	1.28
More than one role	1.27
English qualification	1.21
Don't know how wages paid	0.34
Don't know employer	0.43
Employed other	0.48
Fixed term/temporary contract	0.73
Special schools	0.77
In role for 10 years +	0.83
% EAL	0.99

This factor was derived by considering telephone survey questions C2a and C2b. If anyone involved was the individual's line manager then this was indicated by a score of one on this factor. Those who did not have their line manager involved in deciding their training and development or did not know what a line manager was, had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups having their line manager involved in deciding their training and development

Table C3.9 Experience of performance management

Variable:	Beta
Vocational qualifications	0.08
Full-time	0.05
More than one role	0.04
Secondary school	-0.09
Specialist and technical staff	-0.08
Mid-sized school	-0.06
Higher academic qualifications	-0.05
Deficiency in reading/writing English in relation to role	-0.05
Employed other	-0.04
Yorks and Humber	-0.04
% EAL	-0.04

This factor considers the ratings of individuals on how useful the performance management system is for discussing progress and identifying training and development needs (C4 and C5 in telephone survey). Higher scores on this factor indicate more positive ratings of the system/process.

Table C3.10 Level of support in meeting training and development needs

Variable:	Beta
Administrative staff	0.07
Vocational qualifications	0.06
Full-time	0.05
More than one role	0.04
55-64 years	0.04
Rural schools	0.04
Secondary schools	-0.18
Employed other	-0.09
% EAL	-0.08
% SEN	-0.07
Specialist and technical staff	-0.07
Higher academic qualifications	-0.05
Mid-sized school	-0.05

This factor was derived from responses to question C7 of the telephone survey, which asked staff how supported they felt in terms of meeting their training and development needs. Higher scores on this factor indicate a greater perception of support.

Table C3.11 Importance of personal development as a reason for taking part in training

Variable:	Beta
Full-time	0.11
Vocational qualifications	0.09
Minority ethnic staff	0.05
Learning support staff	0.05
Special schools	0.04
Metropolitan authorities	0.04
More than one role	0.03
55-64 years	-0.16
45-54 years	-0.08
65 years +	-0.08
Specialist and technical staff	-0.05
Higher academic qualifications	-0.04

This factor was derived from summing individuals' responses to two items in questions D1 (f and g). The scoring of the items was reversed so a greater perception of importance of 'personal development' as a motivator is indicated by a higher score on this factor.

Table C3.12 Importance of career advancement as a reason for taking part in training

Variable:	Beta
Full-time	0.11
Vocational qualifications	0.11
18-24 years	0.08
Minority ethnic staff	0.07
Metropolitan authorities	0.06
East Midlands	0.05
25-34 years	0.05
55-64 years	-0.25
45-54	-0.11
65 years +	-0.10
Higher academic qualifications	-0.07
At school for 10 years +	-0.06
English qualifications	-0.05
Men	-0.04
Specialist and technical staff	-0.03

This factor sums individuals' responses to four items in question D1 (b, c, d and e). The scoring of the items was reversed so a greater perception of importance placed by staff on career development as a reason for taking part in training and development is indicated by a higher score on this factor.

Table C3.13 Number of barriers to personal development

Variable:	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.14
Specialist and technical staff	0.13
Learning support staff	0.10
Higher academic qualifications	0.08
English qualifications	0.08
Pupil support staff	0.07
Administrative staff	0.06
Secondary schools	0.06
Deficiency in reading/writing English in relation to role	0.05
South West	0.04
At school for 3-4 years	0.04
18-24 years	-0.10
55-64 years	-0.06
Minority ethnic staff	-0.04
Don't know how wages paid	-0.04
East Midlands	-0.04

This factor is a sum of items in question D2. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate a greater number of barriers.

Table C3.14 Number of information sources used

Variable:	Beta
English qualifications	0.10
Vocational qualifications	0.07
Wages paid all year, hours all year	0.05
Age refused	0.04
18-24 years	-0.09
Don't know employer	-0.05
Mid-sized school	-0.05
25-34 years	-0.04
Employed by school	-0.04

This factor is a sum of items in question D4b of the telephone survey. Each source of information mentioned was given a point, so a score of six for an individual on this factor indicates that they would like to receive information in six different ways. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate a greater number of mediums desired or used for receiving information.

Table C3.15 Information on training - use local sources

Variable:	Odds ratio
Rural schools	1.45
English qualifications	1.32
In role for 10 years +	1.20
18-24 years	0.42
Don't know employer	0.43
Specialist and technical staff	0.43
Employed by other	0.57
Higher academic qualifications	0.70
Secondary schools	0.71
25-34 years	0.71
Employed by school	0.73
Mid-sized schools	0.79

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions D4b of the telephone survey. A score of one on this factor indicates that local source of information, such as the school and the employer, were used or desired. A score of zero indicates that local sources of information were not used or desired. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups desired or used local information sources.

Table C3.16 Information on training - use government sources

Variable:	Odds ratio
Administrative staff	3.50
Higher academic qualifications	2.85
Vocational qualifications	1.73
Full-time	1.67
45-54 years	1.48
Pupil support staff	0.40
In role for 10 years +	0.49
In role for 5-9 years	0.59

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions D4b of the telephone survey. A score of one on this factor indicates that government sources of information, such as the DCSF and the TDA, were used or desired. A score of zero indicates that government sources of information were not used or desired. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups desired or used government information sources.

Table C3.17 Information on training - use other sources

Variable:	Odds ratio
Specialist and technical staff	3.16
Wages term-time, hours term-time	1.75
English qualifications	1.47
Secondary schools	1.42
Higher academic qualifications	1.37
Wages paid all year, hours all year	1.37
Vocational qualifications	1.16
Rural schools	0.53

This factor was derived by considering responses to questions D4b of the telephone survey. A score of one on this factor indicates that sources of information, other than those included in the 'local' and 'government' categories, were used or desired. A score of zero indicates that other sources of information were not used or desired. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups desired or used other information sources.

Table C3.18 Number of inductions into current role

Variable:	Beta
In role for 5-9 years	0.11
In role for 10 years +	0.11
Full-time	0.07
Learning support staff	0.07
25-34 years	0.06
Minority ethnic staff	0.06
More extended services	0.05
More than one role	0.05
18-24 years	0.04
Teaching assistants	0.04
Rural schools	0.04
At school for 10 years +	-0.19
At school for 5-9 years	-0.13
% EAL	-0.07
Higher academic qualifications	-0.07
Employed by other	-0.07
Secondary schools	-0.07
Specialist and technical staff	-0.05
Wages term-time, hours term-time	-0.05
Don't know how paid	-0.05
Don't know employer	-0.04
45-54 years	-0.04
Mid-sized schools	-0.04

The 'role-specific induction' factor is a sum of question E1 in the telephone survey. Each form of induction was given a point, so a score of three for an individual on this factor indicates that they received three different types of role-specific induction. Higher scores on this factor therefore indicate a greater number of types of induction.

Table C3.19 No training and development in relation to role in past 12 months

Variable:	Odds ratio
65 years +	2.20
Don't know how wages paid	2.13
25-34 years	1.54
Secondary schools	1.25
Learning support staff	0.18
Teaching assistants	0.18
Pupil support staff	0.37
Special schools	0.50
Administrative staff	0.53
Full-time	0.56
English qualifications	0.65
At school for 3-4 years	0.67
Rural schools	0.70
Vocational qualifications	0.82
More extended services	0.98

This factor was derived by considering telephone question E2. If anyone involved had not had training in the last twelve months this was indicated by a score of one on this factor. Those who had training had a score of zero on this factor. The analysis of this factor involved predicting the likelihood of various groups not having some form of training in the twelve months preceding the time of the survey.

Table C3.20 Pupil-focused training in past 12 months

Variable:	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.48
Learning support staff	0.41
Pupil support staff	0.31
Special schools	0.15
Vocational qualifications	0.08
Specialist and technical staff	0.08
Full-time	0.08
Administrative staff	0.04
At school for 10 years +	0.04
18-24 years	0.03
Mid-sized schools	-0.03

This factor was derived summing up how many pupil-focused training and development activities individuals had attended over the past year (some items in E2). Each activity was given one point so an individual with three points on this factor had attended three activities. Therefore higher scores indicating more pupil-focused training and development activities.

Table C3.21 Number of benefits of training

Variable:	Beta
Vocational qualifications	0.07
Higher academic qualifications	0.05
Achievement – middle quintile	0.05
Largest schools	-0.05
Specialist and technical staff	-0.05
Wages term-time, hours term-time	-0.05

This factor is a sum of question E11 of the telephone survey. Each perceived benefit was given a point, so a score of six for an individual on this factor indicates that they identified six benefits of the training and development they received. Higher scores on this factor indicate a greater number of benefits.

Table C3.22 Satisfaction and relevance of training

Variable:	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.22
Learning support staff	0.21
Administrative staff	0.14
Pupil support staff	0.13
Full-time	0.07
Special schools	0.06
English qualifications	0.05
Vocational qualifications	0.05
At school for 3-4 years	0.03
Secondary schools	-0.10
Don't know how paid	-0.04
Don't know type of contract	-0.04
Higher academic qualifications	-0.04
Metropolitan authorities	-0.04
25-34 years	-0.04

This factor sums individuals' responses to questions E9 and E10. The scoring of the items was reversed so a greater perceived level of satisfaction is indicated by a higher score on this factor.

C4 Support staff telephone survey: change over time regression tables⁸⁷

Table C4.1 Mathematics qualification

Variable:	Odds ratio
Men	5.42
55-64 years	1.59
Pupil support staff	1.57
Fixed/temporary contract	0.62

Table C4.2 English qualification

Variable:	Odds ratio
18-24 years	4.58
Learning support staff	2.94
Teaching assistants	2.20
Administrative staff	2.20
Girls school	2.17
Pupil support staff	1.71
Rural schools	1.64
In role for 2 years +	1.44
Men	0.39

Table C4.3 Confidence in ICT

Variable:	Beta
English qualifications	0.06
55-64 years	0.04
Rural schools	0.04
Mathematics qualifications	-0.15
Administrative staff	-0.06
18-24 years	-0.04
Minority ethnic staff	-0.03

⁸⁷ Please note that only variables relating to statistically significant changes over time are shown in these tables. Other significant factors, not relating to change over time, are not reported.

Table C4.4 Staff involved in deciding training and development

Variable:	Beta
Administrative staff	0.04
Employed by other	-0.04
% EAL	-0.04

Table C4.5 Have line manager involved in training and development

Variable:	Odds ratio
Teaching assistants	1.47
Fixed/temporary contract	0.63

Table C4.6 Experience of performance management

Variable:	Beta
Largest schools	0.05
Administrative staff	0.04
% EAL	-0.04

Table C4.7 Level of support in meeting training and development needs

Variable:	Beta
Don't know type of contract	0.05
Rural schools	0.01
Mid-sized schools	-0.08
% EAL	-0.05
Special schools	-0.05

Table C4.8 Importance of personal development as a reason for taking part in training

Variable:	Beta
Metropolitan authorities	0.04

Table C4.9 Importance of career advancement as a reason for taking part in training

Variable:	Beta
No significant change	0.09

Table C4.10 Number of barriers to personal development

Variable:	Beta
No significant change	-0.01

Table C4.11 Number of induction activities into current role

Variable:	Beta
% EAL	-0.05
Employed by other	-0.04

Table C4.12 No training and development in relation to role in past 12 months

Variable:	Odds ratio
25-34 years	1.79
Secondary schools	1.32
Full-time	0.68
Pupil support staff	0.73

Table C4.13 Pupil-focused training in past 12 months

Variable:	Beta
Achievement – highest quintile	0.06
In role for 2 years +	0.05
Achievement – second highest quintile	0.04

Table C4.14 Number of benefits of training

Variable:	Beta
Achievement – middle quintile	0.07
Mathematics qualification	-0.06

Table C4.15 Satisfaction and relevance of training

Variable:	Beta
Secondary schools	-0.04
25-34 years	-0.04

C5 Leaders survey: regression tables

Table C5.1 Importance of strategic factors

Variable:	Beta
Larger schools	0.33
Achievement – second lowest quintile	0.08
Unitary authorities	-0.11

This factor sums individuals' responses to the 'strategic' items in question 4a (2nd, 5th and 6th items) of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater importance placed on the strategic factors is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.2 Confidence in adapting support staff roles

Variable	Beta
% SEN	0.66
Administrative staff	0.20
Teaching assistants	0.18
Learning support staff	0.18
Pupil support staff	0.16
Achievement – middle quintile	0.06
Achievement – highest quintile	0.05
Larger schools	0.05
Longer in role	0.04
Have disability	0.04
North East	0.04
Special schools	-0.59
Men	-0.06
London	-0.06
Yorks and Humber	-0.03

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 4b of the leaders survey. Responses for different types of support staff were explored. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater confidence is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.3 Degree of growth expected in support staff hours

Variable	Beta
Pupil support staff	0.23
Learning support staff	0.22
Teaching assistants	0.22
Administrative staff	0.19
Specialist and technical staff	0.16
Secondary schools	0.09
Minority ethnic staff	0.08
Rural schools	0.06
Special schools	0.05
% EAL	0.05
Achievement – highest quintile	0.04
55 years +	-0.06
More extended services	-0.05
West Midlands	-0.05

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 5b of the leaders survey. Responses for different types of support staff were explored. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater growth anticipated is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.4 Confidence in identifying the training needs of staff

Variable	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.20
Learning support staff	0.16
Administrative staff	0.14
Pupil support staff	0.12
North West	0.06
More extended services	0.04
Men	-0.10
Secondary schools	-0.07
SBM	-0.07
% EAL	-0.05

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 6 of the leaders survey. Responses for different types of support staff were explored. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater confidence is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.5 Confidence in accessing training to meet the needs of staff

Variable	Beta
Teaching assistants	0.31
Learning support staff	0.26
Administrative staff	0.24
Pupil support staff	0.22
Specialist and technical staff	0.06
Rural schools	0.06
Special schools	0.05
Longer in role	0.05
Men	-0.11
Achievement – second lowest quintile	-0.07
West Midlands	-0.05
SBM	-0.04
Achievement – second highest quintile	-0.04
London	-0.04
% EAL	-0.04

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 7a of the leaders survey. Responses for different types of support staff were explored. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater extent is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.6 Importance of core curriculum subjects

Variable:	Beta
% FSM	0.13
Rural schools	-0.16

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 8 of the leaders survey. The factor sums how many types of support staff were identified to have the most important area for professional development within the five options relating to core curriculum subjects. So a score of three on this factor means that three types of support staff have core curriculum subjects as their most important area for professional development. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.7 Importance of other subjects

Variable:	Beta
55 years +	-0.13
% pupils eligible for free school meals	-0.12

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 8 of the leaders survey. The factor sums how many types of support staff were identified to have the most important area for professional development within the four options relating to other subjects. So a score of three on this factor means that three types of support staff have other subjects as their most important area for professional development. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.8 Importance of SEN and welfare

Variable:	Beta
North West	0.13

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to question 8 of the leaders survey. The factor sums how many types of support staff were identified to have the most important area for professional development within the four options relating to SEN and welfare. So a score of three on this factor means that three types of support staff have this area as most important for their professional development. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.9 Importance of professional standards in selecting training

Variable:	Beta
Achievement – middle quintile	0.10
Deputy headteacher or equivalent	0.10
North West	0.09

This factor uses individuals' responses to the first item in question 10a of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater importance is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.10 Importance of applicability and relevance in selecting training

Variable:	Beta
Other role	-0.18
SBM	-0.11
West Midlands	-0.08

This factor uses individuals' responses to the second and third items in question 10a of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater importance is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.11 Importance of financial resources in selecting training

Variable:	Beta
% FSM	-0.17
Achievement – highest quintile	-0.11
% EAL	-0.10

This factor uses individuals' responses to the fourth and fifth items in question 10a of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater importance is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.12 Importance of location and provider in selecting training

Variable:	Beta
Achievement – second lowest quintile	0.12
55 years +	0.10
Achievement – second highest quintile	0.09
Larger schools	-0.24
% FSM	-0.20
Achievement – highest quintile	-0.10
East Midlands	-0.10
% SEN	-0.09
Men	-0.09
Minority ethnic staff	-0.08

This factor uses individuals' responses to the sixth, seventh and eighth items in question 10a of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so greater importance is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.13 Funding barriers - local issues

Variable:	Beta
Special school	-0.15
Yorks and Humber	-0.11
More extended services	-0.09

This factor uses individuals' responses to the first three items in question 11 of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so higher frequency is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.14 Funding barriers - funding access issues

Variable:	Beta
Achievement – second highest quintile	0.19
Achievement – second lowest quintile	0.12
Secondary schools	-0.18

This factor uses individuals' responses to the last three items in question 11 of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so higher frequency is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.15 Frequency of barriers

Variable:	Beta
Achievement – second highest quintile	0.10

This factor sums individuals' responses to the items in question 12 of the leaders survey. The scorings of the items were reversed so higher frequency is indicated by a higher score on this factor. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.16 Timing barriers - training hours in relation to contracted hours

Variable:	Beta
% FSM	0.21
Achievement – highest quintile	0.10
Other role	-0.10

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to the first two items in question 13 of the leaders survey. Higher score indicates higher frequency of encountering the problem of trainings taking place within contracted hours, whilst lower score indicate higher frequency of encountering the problem of training taking place outside contracted hours. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Table C5.17 Timing barriers - time availability

Variable:	Beta
London boroughs	0.14
Unitary authorities	0.09
Deputy headteacher or equivalent	-0.12

This factor was constructed using individuals' responses to the last two items in question 13 of the leaders survey. Higher score indicates having time availability as a barrier more frequently. Regression analysis then identified which respondent and school level characteristics were related to this factor.

Appendix D. Support staff categories and roles

Category	Role	Category	Role	Category	Role
Site staff	Cleaner Caretaker Premises supervisor/manager Site manager Catering assistant Assistant cook Cook Catering manager/Kitchen supervisor Site staff 'other'	Pupil support	Learning mentor Careers adviser <i>Connexions</i> personal adviser Behaviour mentor Education welfare officer Home-school liaison officer Welfare assistant Health care assistant School nurse Physiotherapists Psychotherapists Speech Therapists School Escorts Pupil support 'other'	Specialist and technical	ICT technician ICT manager Science technician Laboratory technician Music specialist Design and technology technician Food technology technician Textiles technician Art and craft technician Library/information assistant Librarian Specialist and technical 'other'
Administrative staff	Clerical assistant Administrator Secretary/PA Receptionist Office manager School business manager Finance officer Bursar Finance technician Data manager Examinations officer Examination invigilator Examinations manager Administrative 'other'	Learning support	Nursery nurse Early years assistant Foundation stage assistant Bilingual support assistant Special needs assistant Learning support assistant Cover assistant Cover supervisor Cover manager Sports coach/technician Learning support 'other'	Teaching assistants	Teaching assistant Classroom assistant Learning support assistant Higher level teaching assistant (HLTAs) Teaching assistants 'other'

Appendix E. Further methodological explanation

E1 Support staff telephone survey, methodology, response details and analysis and reporting

E1 provides a technical and detailed introduction to the presentation of findings derived from this study's second and final telephone survey of support staff (Wave 2), conducted in November 2008.

E1.1 Research aims

This support staff telephone survey had three key research aims:

- to explore support staff experiences and perceptions of their training and development
- to provide findings which specifically fill gaps in current knowledge about the training and development of support staff and their related needs
- to measure change over time.

To achieve these aims the research has gathered data on two occasions: in November/December 2006 (Wave 1) and in November/December 2008 (Wave 2), which is reported here. On both occasions, the telephone survey collected information from support staff based on a series of key research themes:

- Background information. What roles support staff had, what they been doing before coming into their current position, what type of contract they had and what was their length of experience. In Wave 2 support staff were also asked about who employed them, how their wages were paid and about their confidence with written and spoken English.
- Qualifications. For instance, exploring what qualifications support staff held or were working towards and what they needed. As a result of learning from Wave 1, in Wave 2 qualifications questions relating to the highest academic qualification held by staff and to vocational qualifications held were significantly re-structured or added.
- Experience of performance management. For instance, about what, if any, performance management and line management processes staff had experienced and if this had been linked to their training and development.

- Communication/information needs. For instance, how staff had found out about and identified their training and development needs, what was their awareness of related information sources, and how their roles related to experiences of accessing information on training and development opportunities.
- Perceptions of training and development. For instance, in relation to training and development, staff were asked about what their motivations for taking up training and development were, what (if any) barriers they had faced, to what extent they perceived their training needs to have been met and about how satisfied they had been with any training and development they had received (in the twelve months before the telephone survey).
- Experience of training and development. For instance, staff were asked about their experiences of training and development in terms of the various sources, contexts and locations of any such training and development (in the twelve months before the telephone survey).

E1.2 Methodology

The methodology was designed to provide evidence about the training and development of support staff, relating findings to different types of schools and to the different roles of these staff. With the TDA's agreement, the research adopted six support staff categories, within which there are a broad range of specific support staff roles (see Appendix D). The six main categories are learning support staff, teaching assistants, pupil support, administrative staff, specialist and technical staff, and site staff. Furthermore, staff who held more than one role were identified for surveying and analysis purposes.

The telephone survey element of the support staff study was conducted over a three-year period (June 2006 to April 2009), and employed two research methods: telephone surveys of support staff and a desk study.

E1.2.1 Telephone survey

The survey content was designed to gather information that addressed the key research themes presented previously and, as at Wave 1, used multiple-, single-, scale- and open-response questions (see Appendix B1). It was designed as a generic document to be appropriate to all roles of support staff regardless of school type or phase.

As in Wave 1, prior to the Wave 2 survey, the questions were piloted with 30 support staff, selected using the information gathered from schools (see also Section 1.3). Piloting was used to confirm the average time the survey took to

complete (the target being no longer than 15 minutes), that staff understood the questions and that the automatic routing and quota matrix system operated as intended. As a result of piloting, it was agreed with the TDA to extend the targeted response time to 17 minutes, so that questions that had been amended and/or added could be put to support staff and a small number of questions were re-worded or restructured.

The findings reported here in Sections 1 - 8, arise from the second of two Waves of the support staff telephone survey. The Wave 2 telephone survey was conducted at the end of the autumn term in 2008 and provides a second measure which, when compared to repeating questions from Wave 1, has provided a measure of change over time.

E1.2.2 Desk study

To inform the focus and content of the survey and to provide contextual information in which the research findings are set and discussed, a study was conducted. The desk study involved gathering and analysing data from a range of relevant documentation related to the key research aims and themes. The desk study commenced in June 2006 and continued throughout the life of the study, finishing in March 2009.

The desk study gathered and analysed data from a range of relevant documents, focusing on research and policy documents concerning the CPD needs of support staff in schools. Specifically, the desk study focused on information about what was known about the training and development of support staff, and also information from governmental and non-governmental organisations, such as that available from the TDA, the National College of School Leadership (NCSL), Unison (Skills4Schools), the Standards website and the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF).

The desk study also explored research into the qualifications held by support staff, the extent to which support staff had experienced performance management, and the employment and recruitment profiles of support staff. This information was used to inform the content of both the Wave 1 and Wave 2 surveys. The outcomes from the desk study have been considered in relation to all findings and, therefore, have helped set the context for and feed into this report.

Overall, 35 potentially relevant documents were retrieved for closer scrutiny. Of these, 27 were judged to be relevant and included in the desk study. These documents cover the following broad categories:

- policy documents
- research reports that relate specifically to teaching assistants (TAs) and to higher level teaching assistants (HLTAs)
- research reports related to support staff more broadly
- guidance documents designed to help school CPD leaders make strategic decisions about the appropriate deployment of support staff
- statistical documents.

E1.3 Sample design and sampling procedures

Findings from a national questionnaire survey of schools, support staff and teachers (Blatchford *et al.*, 2006a; 2007) provided an indication of the possible numbers of full-time equivalent staff for each post title in England. However, there was no comprehensive list of support staff working in schools which could have been used as a direct sampling frame (before this study). Hence, for both Wave 1 and Wave 2 a multi-staged process was adopted, in which the research team identified appropriate samples of schools, collected basic (and up-to-date) information about the support staff in those schools and then, via telephone calls, approached support staff within those schools to participate in the study.

E1.3.1 School sampling

Drawing the school sample

For Wave 2, the sampling process involved approaching the schools that had agreed to provide information for Wave 1 and drawing a top-up sample of schools to:

- reduce burdens on schools by including more schools in the study, so that fewer phone calls would be made to each school agreeing to participate (learning from Wave 1 had indicated that it would be beneficial to reduce rates of calling to individual schools)⁸⁸
- allow for sample attrition from Wave 1

⁸⁸ The TDA seeks to minimise burden on schools.

Apart from the school being approached for a second time to provide information about support staff, as in Wave 1, the sampling process involved the identification of a sample of schools from which information about support staff could be gathered for respondent sampling. Using NFER's Register of Schools⁸⁹, top-up schools were randomly selected using a stratified sampling procedure to reflect:

- the overall numbers of primary, secondary and special schools in the nine Government Office Regions (GORs) in England
- size of school (for special schools, phase of education i.e. whether they were primary and/or secondary, was used as a stratifier instead of size).

However, for the top-up sample different sampling fractions were used for different types of school. There are several reasons for this:

- The overall aim of the telephone survey was to explore the training and development of support staff across the English school system. It was therefore important to ensure that specific subgroups of support staff, both within and across phases/types, were adequately represented within the final sample whilst minimising the administrative burden placed on schools.
- The number of support staff per school (and the nature of their roles) differed depending on phase/type.
- Since there are relatively small numbers of special schools, we selected a larger proportion of them.

Gathering support staff information

Once the top-up schools' sample had been drawn, headteachers in these schools and the schools who had provided support staff information for Wave 1 were written to and asked to complete (or pass on to another member of staff for completion) an online proforma. Two shortened versions of the proforma were configured for Wave 2, one for schools who had already provided information (which was pre-populated so that these schools were simply asked to update their information) and another for top-up schools. In both cases, the proformas confirmed and/or captured key data about each schools' complement of support staff, including:

- an indication of the total number of support staff at each school

⁸⁹ The Register contains data on all maintained schools in England including size of schools, levels of attainment, level of entitlement to Free School Meals, location, and headteacher names.

- which category each member of staff belonged to and their role
- the names of support staff.

The nature of the respondent profiles meant that it was not possible to survey the same staff for Wave 2 as were contacted during Wave 1, because it is likely that a large number would have moved job and/or would not have been available at the time of Wave 2. Therefore, a new sample of support staff was drawn for Wave 2, using information collected by NFER's Research Data Services (RDS), but as far as was possible using the same sample of schools as Wave 1.

Wave 2 responses from schools

Table E1.1 shows the number of schools that were drawn, the number of schools that provided support staff information at Wave 2 and the number of support staff records collected. The sample of schools approach was based on the assumption that:

- 15 per cent of all schools would agree to provide support staff information (an assumption based on experience gleaned from Wave 1)
- there was a need to minimise the burden placed on each school for Wave 2 by having more schools in the sample
- 3,200 interviews needed to be completed
- one-in-three of the support staff contacted by Ipsos MORI would agree to be interviewed, hence at least 9,600 support staff records were needed.

Table E1.1 Wave 2 school recruitment and information gathering

School type	N=:		
	schools drawn	schools that returned records	staff records received
Primary	2437	538	8386
Secondary	744	159	9843
Special	512	112	3940
N=	3693	809	22169

Table E1.1 shows that, due to a more realistic expectation for responses and a comprehensive and sustained programme of telephone and written reminders to schools, targets in terms of the number of schools and support staff records

were exceeded. Further, response figures indicate that overall in relation to all schools about two fifths of those drawn returned support staff records (in the range 21 to 22 per cent). Further, Tables A1 to A3 (see Appendix A) show that the sample of schools that provided interviewees generally reflected the national picture.

As in Wave 1, of those schools that declined to provide information (and provided a reason), the main reason given was the amount of time taken for them to complete the online proforma. However, this observation had been taken into account when designing the proforma for Wave 2 where, to ensure that the burden on schools in the Wave 2 was reduced further, the following actions were taken:

- simplifying the online proforma for existing and top-up schools by removing the 'employed by' and 'time available at school' fields, which had been included in Wave 1 proformas
- pre-populating the online form with data already collected for each of the schools agreeing to participate for a second time, so that these schools simply had to update the information
- drawing a larger number of schools, anticipating lower rates of school agreement to participate.

E1.3.2 Respondent sampling

Respondent sampling

As in Wave 1, the research team adopted a strategy that sought to achieve broadly similar sample numbers across support staff roles (and school types), rather than attempting a sample that was absolutely representative of the total number of support staff in each role category and by each school type. This has enabled useful analysis of data at the respondent category level and in relation to the school stratifiers previously listed. Table E1.2 shows the intended numbers of Wave 2 survey responses to be achieved by support staff category and by the school stratifiers.

Furthermore, the research team retained a strategy that did not attempt (or need) to gather the personal contact details of support staff, such as addresses and/or personal telephone numbers, from schools and/or third parties.

Table E1.2 Wave 2 intended numbers of interviews to be achieved by support staff category and school stratifiers

PRIMARY	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Smallest 3rd	78	125	92	67	31	71	464
Middle 3rd	109	136	118	61	56	78	558
Largest 3rd	107	139	120	45	93	68	572
N=	294	400	330	173	180	217	1594
SECONDARY	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Smallest 3rd	43	69	55	83	51	69	370
Middle 3rd	63	35	43	116	63	77	397
Largest 3rd	48	49	49	107	74	65	392
N=	154	153	147	306	188	211	1159
SPECIAL	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Primary	27	46	25	8	7	11	124
Secondary	37	54	21	17	32	17	178
Both	71	143	72	34	57	40	417
N=	135	243	118	59	96	68	719

N=3,472

Contacting support staff

As in Wave 1, once the support staff information had been gathered from schools, it was entered into an electronic quota⁹⁰ ‘matrix’. The matrix, wherever possible, was configured to provide three matched records for every interview we intended to achieve, in line with the expected one-in-three success rate. The matrix automatically selected staff for Ipsos MORI to telephone, thereby ensuring that the survey was conducted with the required numbers of staff in each of the six categories (and in relation to support staff with more than one role) and according to the school stratifiers. The matrix was successfully piloted for Wave 2 at the same time as the survey.

Ipsos MORI staff used the main switchboard telephone number of each school to call the selected support staff. In many cases, as anticipated, more than one call was needed to arrange for the survey to be completed. However, due to

⁹⁰ As in wave 1, in the case of specialist and technical staff a ‘census’ approach was adopted because the relatively small number of records collected preclude the one-in-three approach.

the involvement of a larger number of schools, smaller volumes of calls were made to each school as had been planned (see ‘response rates’ below for further comment).

Response rates by staff category and school type

Table E1.3 shows that a total of 3,261 support staff were surveyed. It should be noted that, due to the higher number of schools at Wave 2 providing records, there were enough records and schools to enable a lower frequency of calls to be made to each participating school.

However, there was confusion in some schools about whether the Ipsos MORI telephone interviewer was phoning to speak to support staff or to follow up the postal survey completed by senior leaders. This might have resulted in a very slight degradation of the expected one call in three success rate, but as can be seen did not stop the overall sample target being reached. Broadly, Table E1.3 also shows that the research team was successful in contacting support staff from across all categories and school types; therefore providing, as intended, the opportunity to meet the research objectives.

Table E1.3 Wave 2 achieved sample by school type and respondent staff category

PRIMARY	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Smallest 3rd	81	136	92	73	11	71	464
Middle 3rd	116	142	119	65	22	78	542
Largest 3rd	112	147	120	48	48	68	543
N=	309	425	331	186	81	217	1549
SECONDARY	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Smallest 3rd	41	64	49	89	55	46	344
Middle 3rd	62	19	40	124	68	63	376
Largest 3rd	38	45	49	115	79	44	370
N=	141	128	138	328	202	153	1090
SPECIAL	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Primary	24	27	23	9	2	11	96
Secondary	37	45	16	18	17	20	153
Both	68	143	70	36	25	31	373
N=	129	215	109	63	44	62	622

N=3,261

When Tables E1.2 and E1.3 are compared, results show that in general intended targets were met, although the research fell short of some staff targets. Table E1.4 details the shortfalls.

The potential for having a small number of specialist and technical staff was anticipated (at both Wave 1 and at Wave 2), hence the census approach adopted by the research team. The shortfall here was due to the low numbers of these staff being available. The shortfall was potentially exacerbated as result of the previously mentioned confusion regarding the purpose of the telephone interviewer's call. It is worth noting that there were shortfalls in relation to teaching assistants, learning support, pupil support and site staff (in secondary and special schools).

Table E1.4 Wave 2, short-falls in sampling

PRIMARY	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Smallest 3rd	3	11	0	6	-20	0	0
Middle 3rd	7	6	1	4	-34	0	-16
Largest 3rd	5	8	0	3	-45	0	-29
N=	15	25	1	13	-99	0	-45
SECONDARY	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Smallest 3rd	-2	-5	-6	6	4	-23	-26
Middle 3rd	-1	-16	-3	8	5	-14	-21
Largest 3rd	-10	-4	0	8	5	-21	-22
N=	-13	-25	-9	22	14	-58	-69
SPECIAL	Learning support	Teaching assistants	Pupil support	Admin	Specialist and technical	Site	N=
Primary	-3	-19	-2	1	-5	0	-28
Secondary	0	-9	-5	1	-15	3	-25
Both	-3	0	-2	2	-32	-9	-44
N=	-6	-28	-9	4	-52	-6	-97

Highlighted in grey are specialist and technical staff in primary and special schools, for whom a census approach was adopted.

E1.4 Analysis and reporting

As previously discussed and as intended, three types of analysis were conducted; basic descriptive statistics (cross tabulations), factor analysis and regression, each of which is explained more fully (for further details about analysis see Appendix C).

E1.4.1 Basic descriptive statistics

While overall frequencies, cross tabulations and significance tests on cross-tabulations were conducted, only the overall frequencies are presented in the text of the main report. This is because the numbers of respondents belonging to any particular subgroup (e.g. school type, gender, category of support staff) varied widely and therefore any interpretation of the resulting data has to be treated with caution. Regression analysis is a more reliable method in these circumstances. To explore change over time, descriptive frequencies that (when compared to Wave 1), differ by six or more per cent are reported. Any differences between the two sweeps have been expressed in terms of percentage points rather than 'percentage change'. Percentage points refer to the arithmetic difference of two percentages whilst 'percentage change' refers to the relative change between the old value and the new one. As the values being referred to are percentages, it is more useful to talk about change using percentage points to avoid any confusion between relative and absolute difference.

E1.4.2 Factor analysis

After frequencies had been produced for all questions, factor analysis was carried out to produce outcomes for use in the regression. This analysis grouped together suitable questions that covered similar issues based on their correlation with each other. The questions to be entered into each of the factor analyses were decided by the research team and corresponded to the themes given as headings for sections within the report structure (e.g. experiences of training and development and experiences of performance management). A number of items from the survey were included in the factor analyses. Some questions were appropriate as they stood, specifically those on some form of Likert scale. Other questions required some manipulation to put them on a suitable scale for inclusion. The analysis was carried out on the whole dataset including all types of schools, with an exploration of any differences between school types (primary, secondary and special) within the regression analysis (see Appendix C1.1, Table C2.1 and C3).

To help explore change over time, the same analysis as described above was also conducted on questions that were the same at Wave 1 and 2. A full explanation of this analysis is provided in Appendix C1.2, Table C2.2 and C4).

E1.4.3 Regression

The basic analysis enabled the research team to look at the responses overall and then broken-down by key variables. However, the cross tabulations do not allow us to establish whether or not a relationship between two variables ceases to exist once other variables are taken into account. For example, it may appear that males are more satisfied with their training and development than females but if we control for age we may find that the apparent relationship between gender and satisfaction is because men at a particular end of the age range are rating their satisfaction differently to those of different ages. The relationship, therefore, exists not between gender and satisfaction but between age, gender and satisfaction.

Regression is a statistical technique that helps to address this problem by predicting the values of some measure of interest, given the values of one or more related measures. In this case the regression analysis allowed the research team to build on the basic descriptive work by considering the affect of background variables on each of the factor scores (or outcomes) once other background variables had been controlled for. All statistically significant findings are reported and relationships between variables are reported in order of significance. Two regressions were conducted, one to analyse Wave 2 responses (see Appendix C1.1, Table C2.1 and C3) and one exploring change over time (see Appendix C1.2, Table C2.2 and C4).

E2 The leaders survey, analysis and reporting

Three types of analysis were conducted: basic descriptive statistics (cross tabulations), factor analysis and regression, each of which is explained more fully below.

E2.1 Basic descriptive statistics

While overall frequencies, cross tabulations and significance tests on cross-tabulations were conducted, only the overall frequencies are presented in the text of the following sections, with the exception of responses related to sample profile. This is because the numbers of respondents belonging to any particular subgroup (e.g. school type, gender, role) varied widely and therefore any interpretation of the resulting data has to be treated with caution. Hence,

regression analysis is a more reliable method in these circumstances. However, a separate technical appendix has been produced which presents all descriptive statistics and cross tabulations.

E2.2 Factor analysis

After frequencies had been produced for all questions, factor analysis was carried out to produce outcomes for use in the regression. This analysis grouped together suitable questions that covered similar issues based on their correlation with each other. The questions to be entered into each of the factor analyses were decided by the research team and corresponded to the themes given as headings for the following sections. A number of items from the survey were included in the factor analyses. Some questions were appropriate as they stood, specifically those on some form of Likert scale. Other questions required some manipulation to put them on a suitable scale for inclusion. The analysis was carried out on the whole dataset including all types of schools, with an exploration of any differences between school types (primary, secondary and special) within the regression analysis (see Appendix C1.3 for a full explanation of the factor analysis, C2 Table C2.3 for a list of variables used and C5 for the all of the significant results of analysis).

E2.3 Regression

The basic analysis enabled the research team to look at the responses overall and then broken-down by key variables. However, the cross tabulations did not allow us to establish whether or not a relationship between two variables ceases to exist once other variables are taken into account. For example, it may appear that headteachers are more satisfied with their support staff's training and development than SBMs but if we control for age we may find that the apparent relationship between role and satisfaction is because headteachers in a particular age range are rating their satisfaction differently to those of different ages. The relationship, therefore, exists not between respondent role and satisfaction but between age and satisfaction.

Regression is a statistical technique that helps to address this problem by predicting the values of some measure of interest, given the values of one or more related measures. In this case the regression analysis allowed the research team to build on the basic descriptive work by considering the affect of background variables on each of the factor scores (or outcomes) once other background variables had been controlled for. All statistically significant

findings are reported and relationships between variables are reported in order of significance (see Appendix C1.3 for a full explanation of the regression analysis, C2 Table C2.3 for a list of variables used and C5 for the all of the significant results of analysis).